

*The Common X^{ian} Instructed by M^r Griffin
Vindicta Responsionis ad Communion, &c. & Wyllyam*

1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800

2 Nonjuror [i.e. N. S. King]
3475 - 43
1-6

THE
Reasonableness and Necessity
OF SOME
PRACTICES
OF THE
REFORMATION
OF THE
Church of ENGLAND,
D E F E N D E D ;

Against the
OBJECTIONS of the *No-just Grounds, &c.*
The Vindication of the No-Necessity, &c.
And the Principles of the *Popish Schoolmen.*

By the Author of the Necessity of an Alteration, &c.

*My Son, hear the Instruction of thy Father, and
forsake not the Law of thy Mother. Prov. i. 8.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for RICHARD KING, at the *Prince's Arms*
in *St. Paul's Church-yard.* 1720.

THE
PRACTICES

OF THE
FORMATION

OF THE
COUNCILS OF ENGLAND

DEFEATED;

Against the

actions of the No-Confession, &c.
The Transgression of the No-Confession, &c.
And the Principles of the Top School.

ESTD



MUSEUM

48

4

8

444



THE
Reasonableness *and* Necessity
OF SOME
PRACTICES
OF THE
REFORMATION
OF THE
CHURCH *of* ENGLAND, &c.

THE Controversy being already
swoln to too voluminous a Bulk,
I shall be as short in my Animad-
versions, as the Nature of my
Subject will bear; and because that Part of
the Argument which relates to Tradition,
has receiv'd a particular Reply from the
Pen of that learned Gentleman, with whom
I have the Honour to be join'd in the Ob-
jections of the *No just Grounds*, I shall wave
this preliminary Dispute, and proceed im-
mediately to the Point, when I have taken
notice of two or three Passages that seem
to carry in them strong Lines of Reflection,
and to give the Advantage on the Answerer's
Side.

It had been observed in the Appendix to the *Necessity of an Alteration*, that the Author of *No sufficient Reason*, notwithstanding his Insinuation, that his Opponents set up Tradition against Scripture, had given no Proof, that the Traditions insisted upon, contradicted the Divine Writings, or that they made any thing necessary which the Scripture does not make (a) so. To this the learned Answerer replies, *Does this Gentleman then write at a Venture, and undertake to answer Books without reading them? If he does not, he might have seen this proved plain enough in the No sufficient Reason, p. 24, 25, 26.*

(4) Ap. p. 155. *and other (b) Places.* This indeed is a pretty odd Consequence. No Body can read those Pages without acknowledging their Force, and submitting to Conviction. To declare their Insufficiency, is to affirm we have not seen them, and not to commend them, is not to know them. This is the Substance and Effect of the Paragraph. But let us see whether the Pages will support the Character he has given them. The first in the Citation is this. "When our Saviour makes not the least mention of any thing more in his Eucharistick Cup than *the Fruit of the Vine*, and yet humane Tradition is appealed to, for making a Mixture of Water, of which our Saviour says not a Tittle, as though it were as necessarily incumbent upon all Christians as the Wine it self, of which he makes express mention: Here is a manifest Opposition between Scripture and (c) Tradition." Is not this very convincing Proof? To beg the Question in Dispute, and suppose the Truth of

(b) No just Gr. p. 12.

(c) No suf. Rea. p. 24.

of the Premises, is unexpected Reasoning. The Signification of *the Fruit of the Vine* is one part of the Controversy; but this Gentleman takes it for granted that it means mere Wine, and from that Supposition draws his Consequence. However, if the *Fruit of the Vine* did signify Wine, his Argument wou'd be of no Force, because our Saviour's declaring there was Wine in the Cup, does by no means shew there was nothing else in it; and since the Scriptures make the Cup itself necessary, and Tradition is only appealed to for the Ingredients of the Cup, it is evident Tradition makes nothing more necessary than the Scripture has made so.

In the same manner, and of the same Force are the Proofs of the two other Pages. The first supposes there is no Ground in Scripture for Prayer for the Dead, and the other takes it for granted that the Form of Oblation contended for is not warranted by the Institution. But surely this Method of treating an Argument does not merit the Appellation of Proof.

The next Passage to be considered is this, that whereas S. Jerome had been urged as an Evidence for Tradition, the learned Answerer replies, that the Words quoted from him are spoken as from a (d) *Luciferian*. (d) No just But since this Objection has been confuted Gr. p. 20. by the learned Author of the Vindication, who has shewn from Instances, that the *Luciferian* Argument was allowed by the Orthodox, I shall refer the Reader to what is said upon that (e) Occasion.

The third Mistake which I shall take notice of, is much too great to be usher'd in with such

(e) Vindic.
of the Rea.
Gr. par.
11. p. 77.

such Strains of Security and Insinuation. The third Sentence alledged from Tertullian (f) No just in Defence of Tradition, was, says this (f) Gr. p. 24. Author, not to be thought at all pertinent without some Artifice to help it, and therefore is represented imperfectly to make it passable. And what is this Artifice? Why the *Et si non* is left out. A strange Artifice indeed, that cites only so much of a Quotation as relates to the Subject for which it is produced, and neglects the Particles by which it is connected to a different Discourse! *Et si non ita evaderet* &c. would have been an imperfect and abrupt Sentence; whereas Tertullian's Mind was as well conveyed without the two first Words as with them. But this will not be acknowledged by the learned Answerer, who objects farther, that by neglecting the Conjunction and the Adverb, a meer Supposition of a Possibility was made a positive (g) Assertion. But how does he prove this? Why he gives you Tertullian's Words, *Et si non ita evaderet conlatio Scripturarum*, &c. and translates them thus. *Tho' a comparing of Scriptures should happen to leave the Argument equal on both Sides; a Translation directly opposite both to the Letter, as himself has quoted it in the Line before, and to the Meaning of the Author. To the Letter; because that says expressly, though a comparing of Scriptures should NOT happen, &c. To the Meaning of the Author; because the Context declares it to have been his Design to shew, that Hereticks were not to be disputed with from Scripture, which they would either accuse of Corruption, or Misinterpretation, but from the Authority of the Church, to whom the Scriptures were committed,*

mitted; which is the Reverse of the Answerer's Translation, as that makes him recommend the Success of Scripture Disputes, and consequently the arguing from thence with Hereticks. For *though the Scriptures shou'd leave the Argument equal on both Sides*, is evidently an abating Expression, and supposes that they do not leave it in that State of Equality. In a Word, this Construction divides the Text from the Context, makes the Father speak contrary to himself, and which is more surprizing, in the Distance of two Lines makes the same thing Negative and Affirmative. But that I may establish the Justness of my own Interpretation yet farther, I shall shew by a parallel Instance, that the Expression in *Tertullian* is equivalent to a positive Assertion. His Words are these: *Though the conferring of the Scriptures should not succeed so as to leave the Argument equal on both Sides, the Order of Things required that the Subject of our present Dispute alone should first be propounded, and the Persons settled to whom the Property of the Scriptures (b) belong.* In like manner if any one should say, *Tho' the Scriptures were not written by Divine Inspiration, the Sublimity of the Subject, and the Purity of the Doctrine contain'd in them wou'd alone suffice to give them the Preference to all other Compositions: Here every Body wou'd acknowledge that the* *Et si non* *was a plain Insinuation that the Scriptures*

(b) *Et si non ita evaderet conlatio Scripturarum, ut utraque partem parem sisteret, ordo rerum desiderabat illud prius proponi, quod nunc solum disputandum est: Quibus competat fides ipsa, cujus sint Scripturæ. Tertul. de Præscript. adv. Hæc. c. 19.*

were written by Inspiration, and yet this Expression is the same with that in *Tertullian*, which consequently has a Right to be interpreted in the same manner. For *par parium est ratio*.

Before I take my leave of this Subject, it may be proper to observe, that whereas the Learned Answerer professes he has lost his Aim, if any, or all of the Quotations from *Tertullian*, take off the Force of the forementioned Woe denounced against those who add to, or detract from the Word of (i) God, he might have spared himself the Trouble of that Application, because none of those Quotations were produced for that Purpose, nor is there any Body who doubts the Truth and Certainty of that Woe; but then we can't see to what purpose it is urged in this place.

(i) No just
Gr. p. 25.

And now let us consider what is offer'd against the Argument drawn from the Talmudick Authority. I challenge, says the (k) Answerer, these Learned Authors to bring any good Proof, that the Distinction of the Fruit of the Vine, and of the Tree, was ever a common manner of Expression amongst the Jews; or if this be too difficult, that it was usual amongst the Rabbins in our Saviour's Days; or if this cannot be done neither, that it was known so much as to one single Jew at that time. Now though this Question has more than once been satisfied already, yet I shall accept this Gentleman's Challenge, and give him an Answer to every Particular. First then, the *Babylonish Talmud*, the Code of the Jewish Laws, testifies that it is a Rabbinical Doctrine, that unmixed Wine is not Blessed with

(k) lb. p. 35

with the Benediction of the Creator of the Fruit of the Vine, but of the (l) Tree.

(l) V. p. 101

And Secondly, R. Eliezer, who lived within seven and thirty (m) Years of our Lord's Crucifixion, declares that the Cup was not blessed till after it had been mixed; which Declaration is thus explain'd by Bartenora:

(m) Maim. Pref. ad Mishn. p. 49. & alij.

" Their Wine was very strong, so that
" they cou'd not drink it without a mixture of Water, and therefore because
" pure Wine was not yet made fit for the Draught, they did not alter their first
" Form of Benediction, but blessed it as
" they did the Grape, *Blessed is he who Creates the Fruit of the (n) Tree.*" But Third-

(n) Suren. Mish. Berach. c. 7. S. 5.

ly, We have the united Testimonies of Shamai and Hillel, both of whom lived forty Years before Christ, and the latter either in or very near his time, witnessing the Mixture of the Cup to precede the Benediction of (o) it. For though the Terms of the Mish-

(o) Res. ad Conc. p.

na are the Schools of Shamai and Hillel, yet Maimonides teaches us, that the Sentence of those Schools is the Sentence of Shamai and

11, 12, 13, 14.

Hillel (p) themselves. But if there was not this Fulness of Evidence to oppose to our Author's Questions, I can't see they wou'd be of any Force or Consequence, because they wou'd prove too much, and an Argument that proves too much, proves nothing. For I challenge him to produce me any one Testimony coæval with St. James, for the

(p) Ubi autem dicit Domus Shammæi & Domus Hillelis, innuit cæterum qui Shammæi & Hillelis sententiam amplectuntur. Maini. Præf. in Seder Zeraim, p. 51.

Catholick Epistle of that Apostle. If then the want of contemporary Evidence be no Argument against the Authority of a Writing which we believe to be inspired, no more can it against the Truth of any other Fact whatsoever; and if we submit to subsequent Testimony for part of the Rule of our Faith, we must also submit to subsequent Testimony for a Question of Jewish Phraseology, because wherever there are the same Motives of Credibility, there of Consequence must be the same Degrees of Assent and Allowance.

(q.) No just Gr. p. 36. But the Talmud, says the Learned (q) Answerer, does by no means affirm the Distinction above mentioned, to have been commonly known and approved of among the Jews, but only that it was to be found among the Rabbins. And who were the Rabbins but the Jewish Magistri sententiarum, the Judges and Interpreters of the Law? Can we imagine they wou'd determine against Custom, and thwart the received Language of their Nation? Wou'd the Doctors of Tradition speak out of common Sense, and declare against immemorial Practice? If they wou'd not, their Distinction was not uncommon, nor their Doctrine Novel? Cou'd the Jewish Sages be ignorant of the Paschal Language, of the Terms appropriated to the most remarkable of their Feasts, and of the constant Benediction of an Annual Solemnity? If we can neither suppose them ignorant of common Practice, nor giving Sentence against common Usage, then it follows that the Distinction to which they give their Suffrage, was both common and approved.

And

And here we may observe, that tho' the Babylonish Talmud was not Collected into the Form in which it now appears, 'till the Year 500, yet the Customs and Facts related in it, are of earlier Original.

The Learned Answerer proceeds in the Argument, and seems willing to resent the Neglect of his Remark from the *Oxford Annotator* upon St. Cyprian, who, as he says, *has observed that it was all one with the Jews, whether their Wine were Pure or Diluted, and cites the Author of the Tosephos for his Assertion; telling us moreover, that from hence it was Tho. Aquinas, and Bonaventure taught, that the Mixture of Water was not of* (r) *Necessity, &c.* (r) No just Gr. p. 37.
'Tis somewhat surprizing to hear this Gentleman call for an Answer to an Objection long since answered, both in the *Defence*, and the (s) *Necessity*. But to give the Reader some farther Satisfaction upon that Point. (s) Def. p. 53. Nec p. 50, 51.
We have no Instances of Dispensation, no Latitude of Practice discoverable in the Writings of the more ancient Jews. The *Tosephot* is no part of the Talmud, but a Modern (t) Appendix, a Collection of Additions that were made to the Talmud some hundred Years after the Compiling of that (u) Code. And if this Objection was better

(t) Post tempus aliquod ipsa Gemara additamentis quibusdam quæ תוספות dixeris, illustraretur. *Surenhus. Pref. Vol. 1.*

(u) Post absolutum demum Talmud Babylonicum, cum per quingentos fere annos, partim calamitatibus publicis, partim gravibus & ambitionis Doctorum diffidiis, studia Literarum turbata fuissent circa tempora R. Salomonis Jarchi, fuerunt alii, qui etiam additiones ad Talmud conscripserunt, quæ Rabbiniis similiter dicuntur תוספות. *Buxtorf. Rabbin. Biblioth. p. 331.*

supported than it is, it wou'd fall short of the Purpose for which it is urged; because as the Eucharistick Wine is necessary by Institution, tho' the Paschal does not appear to be so, so may the Eucharistical Water be necessary, tho' the Paschal is not. From the Paschal Cup we learn the Ingredients of the Eucharistic Cup, which was Instituted at that Solemnity: But it is only from our Saviour's Precept that we are taught the Necessity, and expect the Supernatural Benefits of the Sacramental Mixture.

But it is from the Tosephos, that Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure taught, that the Mixture of Water was not of Necessity, or
 (x)No just so much as of the Integrity of the (x) Sacrament.
 Gr. p. 37.

This Objection is somewhat unfortunate. These Gentlemen have been drawing up their Forces against Jewish Authority, and have spent many Pages in Opposing the Testimony of the Talmud, and at last it appears that the Principle of the no Necessity of the Eucharistical mixture is founded in Jewish Testimony, and owes its Original to Post-Talmudical Decisions, to as Modern Authority among the Jews, as the Schoolmen are among the Christians.

The next thing I shall take notice of, is an Insinuation, that the Words cited from Dr. Lightfoot, are not to be found in any part of the Talmud; which Insinuation is supported by Dr. Wotton's Authority, who says, That Surenhusius quotes the Gemara for the contrary Explication. Now the Reverse of both these Objections I shall shew to be true. And first for Dr. Lightfoot's two References. The words as they stand

stand in the *Hora Hebraica*, are these: *The Rabbins have a Tradition over Wine, which hath not Water mingled with it; that they do not say this Blessing, Blessed be he that Created the Fruit of the Vine, But Blessed be he that Created the Fruit of the (y) Tree.* And again, *The Learned Jews agree with R. Eliezer, that the Cup of Blessing is not to have the Benediction pronounced over it, till 'tis mix'd with (z) Water.* (y) Hor. Heb. in S. Matth. p. 298.
The Talmud has not only the same thing, but almost the same words. The Rabbins have deliver'd concerning Wine, that till they have put Water in the middle of it, they don't Bless over it, who Createth the Fruit of the Vine, but who Createth the Fruit of the (a) Tree. (z) Hor. Heb. in 1 Cor. xi. 25.
 And again, *The Wise Men agree with R. Eliezer concerning the Cup of Blessing, they do not Bless over it till they have put Water in the middle of (b) it.* See the Original in the Margin. So far was Dr. Lightfoot from being mistaken, that if he had given us the Hebrew Words instead of the Translation, we cou'd not have had a juster, or more exact Notion of the Talmudick Determination than we have. As for the other Objection, *Surenhusius's* Quotation of the Gemara is neither from the same Section, nor the same Chapter of the Talmud with Dr. Lightfoot's; nor is it necessarily limited to an opposite Sense. The Passage is this, *Over Wine they don't say the Words, who Createth the Fruit*

(a) חר יין ער שלא נתן לחוכו מים אין מברכי עליו בפ
 הגפן אלא בורא פרי העץ Talmud Babyl. p. 50.

(b) מורי חכמי לרבי אליעזר בכוס של ברכה שאין מברכי
 עליו ער שיתן לחוכו מים ib.

of the Tree, but they distinguish that with a particular Benediction, who Createth the Fruit of the Vine, although it is the Fruit of the Tree, and this upon the account of its Excellency. For it is said, Psal. 104. 15. *Wine maketh glad the Heart of (c) Man.* Here is no mention of unmixed Wine, no Declaration of Blessing without a Mixture, or before the Infusion of the Water, one of which might certainly have been expected to prove a Contrariety between the *Gemara* in *Surenhusius*, and the same in *Lightfoot*. On the other hand the Terms are General and Unlimited; and we are not told whether the Wine, to which the Blessing of the Fruit of the Vine is appropriated, be Diluted or Undiluted. Now when the Language is thus common and Equivocal, when the Expression is dubious, and lies open to a double Interpretation, which Sense shou'd we prefer, but that which is agreeable to other Testimonies of undoubted Signification? or shou'd we explain the Rabbies into Discord and Opposition, when they are capable of Consistency, and may be reconciled without any Violence to the Rules of Speech or of Reason?

Besides both *Bartenora* and *Maimonides* testify, that the Jews never drank unmixed (d) Wine, from whence we may reasonably

(d) Bart. & Maim. in Berac. c. 7. §. 5.

(c) Super vino non dicunt, Qui creat fructum arboris. sed singulari Benedictione illud insigniunt, Qui creat fructum vitis, quamvis sit fructus arboris; & hoc propter præstantiam ejus, uti dicitur, Psal. 104. 15. *יין ושמח לבב אנוש* Surenhus. in Beracoth, Cap. 6. §. 1.

infer,

infer, that it was diluted Wine which they blessed, and this is further confirmed by the Observation of *Surenhusius* and *Rambam*, who both declare, that according to those People it was not lawful to enjoy any thing without Blessing of (e) it. But we have no Account here of Blessing of the Water, and may therefore fairly suppose it to be included in that of the Wine; and consequently, that the Words, *Fruit of the Vine*, relate to the whole Mixture.

From the Commentary we pass to the Text, from the *Gemara* to the *Mishna*; and here the Substance of the Argument may be reduced to these two Objections. First, That the Blessing of *the Fruit of the Vine* was by the Mishnaical Direction to be pronounced over mere Wine. And, Secondly, That *the Fruit of the Tree* was never applied to Wine by the Doctors of those Times. For the Proof of the first we are referred to the two following Mishna's, or Canons. "What Blessings are used for Fruits? For the Fruits of the Trees, he that Blesses, says, *Thou that Createdst the Fruit of the Tree*. Except for Wine. For Wine he says, *Thou that Createdst the Fruit of the Vine*. Berachoth. c. VI. §. I. And "Men do not Bless for the Wine, till Water is poured into it, says *R. Eliezer*, but the wise Men say they do Bless." *Berachoth*, c. 7. §. 5. Now as to the former Canon, it is so far from directing the Blessing to be Pro-

(e) *Surenhusius* in *Berac.* cap. 6. §. 1. *Ramb.* in *Præf.* ad *Seder Zeraim*, p. 22.

nounced over pure Wine, that it does not once mention it. The Term Wine has been often proved to be applicable even to a Mixture it self, and since the *Jews* always drank their Wine mixed, and this Place relates to no other Wine than what they drank, I think it follows in reasonable Construction, that this place also shou'd be interpreted of a Mixture. As to the other Canon, there are these Difficulties lye against it. The *Wise Men* do indeed determine contrary to *R. Eliezer*; but this Determination, whether we regard the Persons Determining, or the Point Determined, can no ways prejudice our Question. For First, The *Wise Men*, and *R. Eliezer* differ only about the Time, not about the Sense and Signification of the Blessing. The one wou'd have it to preceed, the other to follow the Mixture. Nor let it be said, that the Pronouncing the Blessing before the Infusion of the Water, was limiting that Blessing to mere Wine, because the Benediction of the Wine might as well include the Water that was afterwards to be incorporated with that Wine, as the Benediction of the first Dish in our common Graces, includes all that are to follow, and as the Calling for a Blessing upon *these thy good Creatures*, which lye before us, includes those that are not before us, but are to be served up when these are consum'd. But Secondly, We are ignorant both of the Number, Age, and Character of the *Wise Men*; whereas *R. Eliezer* is testified both by *Surenhusius*, *Maimonides*, and the *Mishna* it self, to have been a Man of prodigious Reputation among the *Jews*, and

to have lived within a few Years of the Period of our Saviour's (f) Crucifixion; and which is more, the very same Code, from which this Canon is objected, does its self prefer him to the Wise Men, and declares in the most significant Terms, the Authority of R. *Eliezer* wou'd overballance the Authority of ALL the Wise Men in (g) *Israel*.

(f) *Suren. præf. in v. 14. Mai-mon. præf. in Mish p. 49. Mishn. v. 4. p. 427.*
(g) *Ibid. p. 428.*

And that R. *Eliezer* well deserved this Character, may farther appear from another Dispute between him and the *Wise Men*, preserved in this same Mishnaical Collection. The Question is, Whether a Man making a Vow, (or saying *Corban*) that his Father, or his Mother shall have no Advantage of his Possessions, or their Paternal Right; may in Virtue of that Vow lawfully withhold Relief, and Honour from his Parents. R. *Eliezer* determines his Oath to be of no force, and declares he is not at Liberty to Dishonour his Parents. The *Wise Men* determine the (h) contrary. Now this is the very Tradition our Lord reprehended in the *Pharisees*, when he told them; *Ye say, Whosoever shall say to his Father, or his Mother, it is a Gift (Corban) by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, and honour not his Father or Mother, he shall be (i) free.* Thus does our Lord give Authority to R. *Eliezer's* Testimony in condemning the *Pharisees*, for the very same Corruption, for which that Rabbi opposes the *Wise Men*.

(h) *Mish. Vol. 3. p. 131.*

(i) *S. Mat. 15. 5. and S. Mark. 7. 11.*

The Second Objection affirms, that the *Fruit of the Tree* was never applied to Wine by the Doctors of the *Misnick* Times. Now though we are no ways concerned for this

part of the Distinction, it being sufficient for our Purpose, to shew that our Lord's Expression of *the Fruit of the Vine*, signified a Mixture, yet I shall examine the Strength of the Reasons upon which this Objection is founded. They are these: *Bartenora* and *Surenhusius* testify, that Wine is blessed with a particular Benediction, and not with the general Form of *Thou that Createdst the Fruit of the Tree*, upon the account of its Excellency above other Fruits of the Tree. This Argument supposes there can be but one Reason for the Benediction of *the Fruit of the Vine*, because if there be more than one, it is to no purpose to urge the Excellency of the Wine. For the mixed Cup may very well be termed *the Fruit of the Vine*, both from its Excellency, and to distinguish it from mere Wine. And that it is so in Fact, appears from the Testimony of the same *Bartenora*, who, as he gives the Excellency of the Wine for a Reason of that Appellation in the Place quoted by this Author, so in his Note upon *Berachoth*, vii. 5. he urges the Mixture for the same; and informs us, that unmixed Wine was called the *Fruit of the Tree*, and blessed with an undistinguished Form of Benediction, because without a Mixture of Water it was not drinkable, nor consequently capable of that Excellency which is expressed by *the Fruit of the Vine*, which, as *Surenhusius* (k) observes, is to make glad the Heart of Man.

(k) Not in
Berac. vi.

1.

But to shorten this whole Dispute, *Schamai* and *Hillel*, Names of the greatest Authority

rity in the (l) *Mishna*, and earlier in time (l) *Prid.*
 than the Crucifixion of our Lord, do both *Connect*
 declare that the Blessing of the Paschal Cup, *par. 2. L.*
 was preceded by (m) the Mixture, and con- (m) *Mishn.*
 sequently that that Blessing which was ex- *Pesac. cap.*
 pressed in the Words *Fruit of the Vine*, did *10. § 2, 4,*
 not relate to undiluted Wine, but a Mix- *7.*
 ture. And the same Practice is testified by
 the most learned of the modern *Jews*, Rabbi
Moses Maimonides, who in his celebrated
 Work, called *Jad Chazakah* and *Mishneh Tho-*
rah, gives a compleat Description both of
 the Order and Subject of the Paschal Solem-
 nity, and therein particularly mentions the
 Number of the Cups, and assures us that they
 were first mixed, and then blessed with the Be-
 nediction of *the Fruit of the Vine*. Take his
 own Words: "They mingle a Cup for eve-
 "ry Man separately, and bless over it: *Bles-*
 "sed art thou who createst the *Fruit of the*
 "Vine. They mingle also a Second Cup,—
 "and afterwards he washes his Hands, and
 "blesses over the third Cup the *Benedictio*
 "Cibi, and drinks it, and then mingles the
 "fourth Cup, and finishes the *Hallel* over
 "it, and recites upon it the *Benedictio Can-*
 "tici; which is, *Let all thy Works praise*
 "thee, O Lord, &c. and pronounces the
 "Blessing who createst the *Fruit of the (n) Vine.*"
 Thus much for the *Jewish Phraseology*.

(n) מוזגין לכל אחד ואחד ומכרך בורא פרי הגפן *Libr.*
 חמץ ומצה *Tralla. Chap. 8. Sect. 1.* יר חוקר

ומוזגין הכוס השני *Ibid. Sect. 2.*

ואחר כך נוטל ידיו ומכרך ברכת המזון על כוס שלש
 ושוחהו ואחר כך מוזג כוס רביעי וגומר עליו את ההלל
 ואומר עליו ברכת השיר והוא יהללך הכל מעשיך וכולו
 ומברך בורא פרי הגפן *Ibid. Sect. 10.*

The

The next Argument produced by the learned Answerer, contends, that because the New Testament is written in *Greek*, therefore *γεννημα ἀμπέλου* can't be a *Jewish* (o) Phrase. (o) No just Gr. p. 49. But alas! every Commentator is a standing Objection to it, and it is contradicted by the very Reason of the Thing. Our Saviour was a *Jew*, and spoke the Language of the *Jews*, consequently whatsoever Sayings of his are related in the New Testament, are of *Jewish* Idiom. The Words indeed are *Greek*, but the Phrase is *Hebrew*. Thus (p) Jonas Niniueh is in the Lxx called *μεγάλη τῷ (p) θεῷ*, Cap. 3. v. 3. when at the same time it was threatned with Destruction for the Sins of the Inhabitants. But though this way of Speech be not found in the *Greek* Language, it is in the *Hebrew*, which frequently expresses the superlative Degree by the Name of God, and by *μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ* means no more than a very great City. Indeed we might as well pretend that our Saviour talk'd *Greek* to the *Jews*, who understood nothing of that Language, as that his Words are to be interpreted by the Idiom of the *Greek* Tongue, which were spoken in that of the *Hebrew*, or *Hebræo-Syriack*.

It had been observed that S. Chrysostom's Argument, concerning the Vines producing Wine, not Water, was no Proof of that Father's opposing the *Talmudick* Distinction, because the Compilers of the *Talmud* did not themselves believe that the Vine produced Water but (q) Wine. This is thought by the learned Answerer to be a Concession destructive of all the Reasons that have been urged in Favour of the *Talmudick* Controversy. This Gentleman, says he, has given

(q) App.
to the Ne.
p. 201.

up that senseless Distinction, about which so great a Noise is (r) made. But how is it given up? Cou'd not the Talmudists believe that the Vine produced Wine, and at the same time express a Mixture by the Fruit of the Vine? All Languages afford Instances of Phrases and Expressions, that have a different Meaning from the Terms out of which they were originally formed. *Plutarch*, no doubt, thought Wine the Product of the Vine, and yet he applies that very Product to a (s) Mixture. Thus the Romans certainly thought *Pecus* signified Cattle and not a Waggon, and yet they call'd their *Denarij*, which were stamp'd with Waggon, &c. *Pecunia*, because their first Coin had the Image of Sheep, or of small Cattle upon (t) them. But he has given up that senseless Distinction. This Liberty of pronouncing upon the Language of foreign Nations is somewhat unaccountable. Was a Man's Knowledge limited to his Mother Tongue, and his Reading to *English* Writers, we might expect some Extravagance of Expression, and allow for Singularity of Thought. But for a Master of the Learned Languages, a Man well acquainted with sacred and profane, with ecclesiastical and classical Writers, to object against the oriental Idiom, because it differs from that of other Countries, and quarrel with the Jewish Phraseology because it suits not our own Ideas, is a surprizing Latitude of Censure. It is assuming a Prerogative over the Minds of Men, and prescribing our own Conceptions to the Universe. But we may as well pretend to restore the Unity of Language that was confounded at *Babel*, as to make the Dialects of different Nations the same ;
for

(r) No just
Gr. p. 41.

(s) Real. p.
10.

(t) v. Kennets Antiq.
p. 372. and
Echards
Ro. Hist. v
1. p. 44.

for one was the necessary Consequence of the other, and as they were inseparable in their Origin, so they will be in their Continuance.

The learned Answerer draws a Parallel between the withholding the Cup at *Lyons*, in the *East-Indies*, and in *Guinea*, and the use of the Mixture in *Palestine*, *France*, *Egypt*, and *Carthage*; and from thence infers, that as the first won't prove the Cup to be laid aside in all *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Africa*, so neither will the other, that the Mixture was used in the same three Parts of the (u) World. But the Instances are not at all alike, because tho' the Practice of the Church of *Lyons* cannot be an Evidence of the Usage of those Churches which are not in Communion with it, yet it may, and is for those of the same Communion; and it was only for those of the same Communion, that the Practice of the Church in *Palestine*, &c. was brought to testify. This is largely proved, and the Objection particularly answered in the learned Dr. *Brett's* Dissertation concerning the Liturgies of the Primitive (x) Church.

(x) p. 372.
& seq.

The Answer to the Objection about Transubstantiation is not thought sufficient, because, as this Gentleman tells us, that was intended only to shew, that the Silence of any part of the ancient Church will no more prove their Reception of the Mixture, than their Acknowledgment of the Transubstantiating (y) Doctrine. But this Argument does no ways come up to the Point, because the Author knows very well that the mere Silence of the Church was never urged in Defence of the Mixture; but the positive Evidence of a Writer of unquestionable Reputation

(y) No just
Gr. p. 66.

putation from every one of the three Parts of the then known World, was thought sufficient to ascertain the Practice of all that were in Communion with them: And 'till this Writer can produce the same uncontradicted Testimony for Transubstantiation, the Cases will be no ways parallel, nor his reasoning of any Force. Besides, as I before (z) observ'd, the ancient Church cannot be said to have been silent of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, because her Tenets were directly destructive of it, which cannot be said of the Churches which are silent about the Mixture. (z) App. p. 168.

The learned Answerer's next Observation is, that the Author of the Appendix *wholly passes over the two first Centuries, as having nothing to plead for them, or to offer against Tertullian's Testimony to the* (a) *contrary*: Which is a Mistake in every Respect, because 1st. *Tertullian* is the only Testimony he produced, and if it had not, *Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Clemens Alexandrinus* were all appeal'd to in the former Part of that Treatise; and 2^{dly}, because *Tertullian's* own Testimony had particularly been considered in the Answer to (b) *No Necessity*. (a) No just Gr. p. 66. (b) p. 77.

Concerning *S. Cyprian* there is nothing offer'd that is material, and therefore I may be spared the Trouble of an Animadversion; however it may be worth observing that this Gentleman's Argument proves strongly against the Purpose for which he brought it. For *S. Cyprian* does not give the least Intimation of an Interruption in the use of the Eucharistical Water, but supposes the contrary, and only blames the Disuse of the Wine. Now if the Wine be allowed to be essential

essential, tho' the Practice of it be not of an uninterrupted Continuance, much more must we allow the Essentiality of the Water, which no Age nor Church for 600 Years together did ever reject or disuse.

Origen comes next, who, says the learned Answerer, *teaches such Doctrine as plainly intimates the Necessity of the Mixture, either not to have been known in his time, or to have met* (c) *No just with some Interruption, if it (c) were.* The Gr. p. 67. proof of this Objection is drawn from that Father's calling our Saviour's Wine *ἀκρατον*. But that Origen did not write *ἀκρατον* appears from the following reasons. The Learned *Huetius* testifies, and all Men acknowledge that this Father's Works are (d) corrupted, and it is an easy and natural mistake for a Transcriber to take *εὐ* for *α*, from whence we may fairly reason the Probability of *ἀκρατον*'s being a corruption of *εὐκρατον*. But the inconsistency of the Context with that Term seems to place the matter beyond Dispute. Origen expressly says that the Cup of Blessing was mix'd, and plainly intimates that this was the same with our Saviour's Cup. Against this indeed some few Suppositions are urged, but they are mere suppositions, and have no Foundation in the Text. He wou'd suppose that *ἐκίρασα* does not signify a Mixture in that place, and that the Cup of Benediction, and the Cup of the Eucharist were different (e) Cups. The first is directly contrary to the Scope

(d) Quotquot Libros Origenis ad nos fortuna trans-
misit, violatos esse. *Huet. Origen. p. 233.*

and Design of the Homily before us, which is to shew the different Signification of mix'd and unmix'd Wine from Scripture Instances, which Difference wou'd be entirely lost and confounded, if *κεράννυμι* be interpreted to any other Sense than that of a Mixture. Besides that it is directly opposed to *ἀκράτον*, as that is said to be the *Ποτῆριον κολάσεως*, and this the *ποτῆριον εὐλογίας*, and can therefore have no other than a contrary Meaning, which is a Mixture. The Second is no more agreeable to *Origen's* Reasoning than the first. For he mentions but three Cups, two of Cursing, and the other of Blessing. If then the eucharistick Cup be not the Cup of Cursing, as I believe no Body will venture to say it is, it must be the Cup of Blessing; but if it be the Cup of Blessing, it is by the express Testimony of this Father mixed; nay *Origen* does so clearly inform us that the eucharistick Cup was the same with the mixed Cup in the *Proverbs*, that it cannot with any manner of Plausibility be question'd, but he believed our Saviour mixed his Cup. "If thou wou'd'st see, says he, the Cup of Blessing, which the Just drink, it may suffice to observe that Saying of Wisdom: *Drink ye the Wine which I have mixed for you*: But behold also my Saviour going up to the Passover, &c." Can any Words be fuller to the Purpose, or is it possible to declare the Cup of our Lord to be the Cup of Blessing in stronger Language, than by affirming, that tho' the Testimony of Wisdom was sufficient to teach us the Ingredients of the Cup of Benediction, yet our Lord's Example at his last Supper should be

D

produ-

produced for it? In short *Origen* does in so many Words testify that the Cup of the New Testament was different from the Cup of unmixed Wine, and that the one signified a Promise, the other a (f) Punishment.

It had been observed that this Passage, as it now stands, is contrary to the general Voice of the Primitive Church, which since *Origen's* Works are owned to be corrupted, is a pretty strong Evidence, that that is not genuine. But says the learned Answerer, it is not yet proved, that the three ancient Fathers cited, are the Voice of the general (g) Church. Now the three Fathers are not all that were quoted upon this Occasion. *S. Cyprian*, the Council of *Carthage*, and the ancient Liturgies had their Share in the Collection; and if it had not been so, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, and *S. Clement*, are sufficient Authorities for the general Voice of the Church. Every Body knows they are the most celebrated Writers of the earliest Times, and the greatest Names of the two first Centuries of Christianity. And from whom should we learn the Practice of Antiquity, but from the noblest Lights and Ornaments of it? But 2dly, Can it be imagined that Churches of such a distant Situation, as *Palestine*, *France*, and *Egypt*, should agree in a Practice which was not in universal Use? And 3dly, Is not the Testimony of the three great Churches of the World, *Rome*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, the general

(f) Ὁρᾷς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τὸ ποτήριον τῆς καὶ τῆς διαθήκης ἔσσαν; ὁρᾷς τὰς κολάσεις ποτήριον οἶνον ἀκράτου. Hom. xii. in Jerem. xiii. 12.

Voice of the Church? And yet S. *Justin* can testify both for *Rome* and *Alexandria*, and S. *Clement* for *Antioch*. In a Word, the Evidence of these three Fathers cannot be confin'd to one Place, because their Persons were not. *Justin Martyr* was born in *Palestine*, and travelled to *Ephesus*, to *Alexandria*, and to (h) *Rome*. S. *Irenæus* was probably born at *Smyrna*, and was Bishop of *Lyons* in (i) *France*. S. *Clement* travelled to *Jerusalem* and to *Antioch*, and was Presbyter of (k) *Alexandria*. And here we may observe that *Rome* was the See of *Clementis Romanus*, and *Antioch* of S. *Ignatius*; so that tho' those two Fathers have not mentioned the Ingredients of the eucharistick Cup, yet we have the Testimony of the Churches over which they presided. In short, the enumeration of these particular Testimonies, will by all the Rules of Reasoning in the World, be look'd upon not only as the general, but universal Voice of the Primitive Church, till such time as this Gentleman can produce some opposite and contradicting (l) Evidence; which he has not yet been able to do.

S. *Cyril* is produced as calling the unmixed Wine at *Cana*, and the Wine in the Eucharist by the one Name of Wine: From whence the Learned Answerer infers, That if his Author will not allow that Wine in both places has the same Signification, he must find out a new Rule of (m) Interpretation. But why a new

(b) Caves
Lives un-
der *Justin*.
(i) Ib. un-
der *Iren*.
(k) Ib. un-
der *Clem*,
Alex.

(m) No ju.
Gr. p. 79.

(l) Evertitur inductio, cum dissimile cæteris exemplum exhibetur. *Burgersdic. Logic. Instit. lib. ii. cap. x. Qu. 5.*

Rule? Is it not certain from common Custom and known Usage, that the same Word has often different Meanings in the same Author? Nay, is there any one Writer in any one Language that will not afford Instances of it? Thus *Virgil* in the compass of eight lines, uses *facio* in two various Senses, viz. To Sacrifice, and to (n) make. And in *Genesis* the Term *House* is made use of both for (o) Comp. a Family and (o) a Building. And which is more, the very Quotation upon which this Author has founded his Argument, proves the contrary, and gives us an Instance of the different Construction of the same word. The Passage, as Translated by the Learned Answerer, is this: *Since our Saviour changed the Water at the Feast of Cana in Galilee into Wine, why cannot he as well CHANGE Wine into his Blood?* Now shou'd we interpret the whole of this Citation, as the Answerer has interpreted a part, we shou'd do a very grateful Work to the Gentlemen of the *Romish* Communion. For thus wou'd they argue in his own (p) words: *It is agreed on all Hands, that our Saviour changed the Substance of the Water into the Substance of Wine. And S. Cyril makes no difference betwixt this Change, and that of the Wine into his Blood. And if our Author will not allow this to be a right Construction of the Word, and that Change in both places has the same signification, he must find out a new Rule of Interpretation, that the World has not yet been acquainted (q) with.* Thus does the Obje-

(o) Comp. *Gen.* 7. 1. with 40. 14.

(p) No just *Gr.* p. 69.

(q) *Ib.* p. 70.

(n) *Cum faciam vitula pro frugibus. Eclog.* 3. 77.
Pollio & ipse facit nova carmina. Ib. 86.

Nor plead in consequence of his Reasoning
 for Transubstantiation. For if *Wine* must
 necessarily signify an undiluted Liquor, be-
 cause it carries that Meaning in the first
 Clause of the Passage, then it follows that
Change must necessarily signify a transubstan-
 tiating of the Elements, because it is allow-
 ed to mean so much when applied to the
Galilaan Water. However I question not
 our Author's Orthodoxy in this Point, but
 am sorry he shews so much Positiveness in a
 Matter so notoriously false, and of such ill
 Consequence to a Doctrine as Primitive as
 it is Protestant, by prescribing a Method of
 Interpretation, which cannot be followed
 but by making S. Cyril a Patron of the
 transubstantiating Doctrine; whereas he may
 easily be proved, did not this Gentleman
 without question acknowledge him to be, an
 Adversary to it. In short then, we are to
 distinguish between a spiritual and material
 Change; for both these are applicable to the
 Word *Change*, and might therefore be both
 used by S. Cyril of different Subjects, such as
 are the Water of *Cana*, and the eucharistical
 Wine. But then we are in the same manner
 to distinguish between mixed and unmixed
 Wine, both of which are also applicable to
 the Term *Wine*, and may be both under-
 stood of different Places. So that S. Cyril's
 Words are very capable of a favourable and
 orthodox Construction, both with regard
 to the Matter of the Eucharist, and the Ef-
 fect of the Consecration upon that Matter,
 but then they will be of no Service to the Ob-
 jector's Argument. For thus he may with
 great Reason be supposed to speak. *Since our*
Saviour [substantially] changed the Water at
the

the Feast of Cana in Galilee into [meer] Wine, why cannot he as well [spiritually] change [mixed] Wine into his Blood?

(r) No just Gr. p. 70. The learned Answerer proceeds to repeat two other Objections of the *No sufficient Reason*; the first of which is drawn from S. Cyril's calling Wine the Type of Christ's Blood, and the other from the Practice of the Greek Church in putting warm Water into the consecrated (r) Cup, and observes that there is no Exception made to them; but the Reader will easily perceive the contrary, when he shall have examined the 66, 67, 75, and 195 Pages of the *Necessity of an Alteration*, in the two last of which he will find a particular Answer to the same Argument with that from S. Cyril, and in the other an express Examination of the Objection concerning the warm Infusion of the Greeks.

(s) Nec. p. 176. It had been observed in relation to S. Chrysostom's professing that our Saviour delivered Wine, that we our selves insist upon Wine as an essential Part of the (s) Cup. But to this the Objector makes a surprizing Demurr, and tells his Reader he doubts we do not always insist upon it as such. "For

(t) No just Gr. p. 71. " if so, says (t) he, I would willingly be taught the Meaning of those two very " strange Questions in the Defence, *If Water may be omitted, why not Wine? Why may not any other Liquor do as well as Wine, especially in those Countries where there is no Vintage?*" The Reader may know then that the Question is conditional. *If Water may be omitted, why not Wine?* The Omission of the Wine is urged only as an Argument *ad hominem*, and to reduce the Objection

tion to an Absurdity. For if our Saviour's Practice will not make Water necessary, neither will it make Wine, because the same Consequence must flow from the same Premises. Either then the Author of the *Defence* thought the Water necessary, or he did not: If he did, it is plain he thought the Wine so too, because he makes them both depend upon the same Principle. If he did not, this Author has been arguing against a Phantom, and disputing upon an imaginary Subject. If the first be true, this Objection means nothing; if the latter, the Objector has had no Design in all he has written upon the Controversy.

But S. Chrysostom, says the learned Answerer, *does not speak of the Wine as a part of the Cup, but as the whole: For he says, our Lord delivered Wine to his (u) Disciples.* If ^(u)No just this Gentleman looks upon this as Proof, I Gr. p. 71. believe he is singular in his Sentiments. For could not S. Chrysostom declare that Christ delivered Wine, without excluding of Water? Or was it impossible for our Lord to deliver Wine and Water at the same time? If it was not, he may be properly said to deliver Wine without denying the Delivery of the Water, or to deliver Water without denying the Delivery of the Wine. Indeed by this Method of Construction we might prove that the Apostles partook only of the Bread, and not of the Cup. For the Scriptures tell us that *the Disciples came together and broke (x) Bread, and that S. Paul, when (x) Acts he was come up again, broke (y) Bread, &c. 20. 7.* without the least Intimation of the Cup. ^(y)1b. 11. And yet there is no Body that imagines the Cup to be excluded by these Texts, nor by
Parity

Parity of Reason can we pretend that Water is excluded by S. *Chrysostom's* mention of Wine. For if the Cup be allowed to be part of the Sacrament, though it be omitted in the mention of that Sacrament, we may also allow the Water to be a part of the Cup, though it be also omitted in the mention of that Cup.

But 2dly, It appears from the Testimony of the *Trullan* Fathers, that S. *Chrysostom* directed the Practice of the Mixture in his own Church; and tho' the Objector has offer'd some Animadversions upon the *Trullan* Determination, yet, since those Animadversions respect the Authority of Discipline, not of Evidence in that Council, and are therefore no part of the Question, I shall content myself with observing that S. *Chrysostom* does, contrary to the Answerer's Assertion, declare the Mixture to be an essential Usage, because in his Liturgy he affirms it to be the Practice and Command of Christ, as I have endeavoured to shew (z) elsewhere, though this Gentleman has taken no notice of it.

(z) Nec.
p. 66.

The learned Answerer proceeds to S. *Basil's* Liturgy, but leaves the Arguments against his Dilemma untouch'd, and has hardly offer'd any one Reason which is not replied to in the Book he is considering. He asks indeed how the *Coptick* Copy comes to be esteem'd more authentick than the other Copies, and charges it with what (a) No just he calls a (a) Corruption. But his Question is beside the Point, because the *Alexandrian* Copy may not be more authentick, and yet may be the best and surest Explanation of the Words in the *Greek*; for an ancient

(a) No just
Gr. p. 73.

ancient Version or Paraphrase is certainly of the greatest and most certain Benefit in interpreting a dubious Passage in any Writer, as appears from the constant Practice of the learned World in recurring to the *Polyglot* Versions for the Explication of Scripture. And as for his Charge, it is no unreasonable Demand to expect he should prove, that beseeching God to hear the Prayers of the Faithful departed for us, is a Corruption, before he makes an Argument of it. For tho' he speaks of praying *by and through the Mediation of the Saints*, there is no such Expression in the Quotation himself has given us, and it is sufficient to appeal to his own Translation for an Answer.

This being all that requires a Reply, I might here dismiss *S. Basil*: But for the farther Satisfaction of the Reader, I shall give him the Substance of the Argument as it lies in the *Necessity*. And that nothing may be wanting to give it all the Light imaginable; I shall first produce *S. Basil's* Words, and the Argument founded upon them in the *No-sufficient Reason*. The Passage from *S. Basil* is this: ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἐν τῇ γεννήματι τῆς ἀμπέλου λαβὼν, κερτάσας, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλόγησας, ἀγιάσας ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς. Likewise taking, mixing, eucharistizing, blessing, sanctifying the Cup of the Fruit of the Vine, he gave it to his holy Disciples. The Argument of the *No-sufficient Reason* is as follows. The Cup, before it is pretended to be mixed, is called here, ποτήριον ἐν τῇ γεννήματι τῆς ἀμπέλου — Wherefore — either κερτάσας does not signify a Mixture — or the Cup, before this Mixture, consisted of Wine only, and so the Fruit of

E the

(b) N. S. *the Vine signifies pure (b) Wine.* To this it R. p. 42, was answered, that either S. Basil did not use the Expression *Fruit of the Vine* in the same Sense in which it is used in Scripture, or if he did, then he spoke agreeably to the Talmud, and called the empty Cup the Fruit of the Vine, in regard to the Ingredients it was afterwards to contain, as we say our Saviour took the eucharistick Cup and consecrated it, tho' it was no more the Eucharist before the Consecration, than it is the Cup of the Fruit of the Vine before the Mixture.

To the first part of this Dilemma our Author has given no Answer, but endeavours to evade the Force of it by calling it
 (c) No just *a wild Supposition extravagantly (c) supported.*
 Gr. p. 73. This indeed is not very ceremonious, but then it is not very logical neither. It is a little too much for the same Person to be the Moderator and the Disputant; the Judge and the Advocate. Some sort of Proof at least was required to make this Freedom of pronouncing unexceptionable. But to let his Language pass. The Reader may observe that S. Basil expressly declares that our Lord mixed the Cup before he gave it to his Disciples, whereas the Scriptures testify that he called it *the Fruit of the Vine* after he gave it to his Disciples, and consequently after it was mixed; from whence it evidently follows, that either S. Basil did not use those Words to express unmixed Wine, or else he used them in a different Sense from our Lord, because himself declares that our Lord denoted a Mixture by (d) them. This is a sufficient Proof of the first part of the Dilemma, and will always be
 look'd

(d) Nec.
 p. 177.

look'd upon as such, till this Gentleman brings some Reason to invalidate it. And as for the other, it is clear from the Instance I have already given, that S. Basil might mean a Mixture by *negotias*, notwithstanding the Cup was called *the Fruit of the Vine* before that Mixture was made, which with more Examples of the same Kind may be seen in *The* (e) *Necessity*.

(e) *Nec.*

But, says our Author, *We have been told* p. 178. *again and again, that the Talmud relates that some of the Rabbins, some time or other, look upon them to call Wine mixed with Water the Fruit of the Vine. But this Gentleman has made a Step farther, and in truth one of a singular Nature, in teaching, without the least Pretence of Proof for it, that they called an empty Cup* (f) *so.* But this Doctrine is not (f) *No just* to be found any where in that Treatise. Gr. p. 75.

For tho' S. Basil is declared to have spoke agreeably to the *Talmud*, when he called the empty Cup *the Fruit of the Vine*, yet is that Agreement plainly referr'd only to the Expression, and the talmudick Cup declared to be a mixed and not an empty (g) Cup. S. (g) *Nec.* Basil spoke agreeably to the *Talmud*, because p. 180.

both meant the same thing by the same Expression: but this will no more infer the Emptiness of the *talmudick* Cup from that of S. Basil's, than the calling the unconsecrated Cup the Eucharist, will infer that the eucharistick Cup is never consecrated. For he that says our Saviour took the eucharistick Cup and consecrated it, certainly means the same thing by the Terms *Eucharistick Cup*, with him that says our Saviour having consecrated the Elements, distributed the eucharistick Cup to his Disciples; and yet one

applies that Expression to as different a Purpose from the other, as S. Basil does from the *Talmud*; that is, both apply it to the same thing, but differ in the time. One calls the *Poculum Consecratum*, the eucharistick Cup, the other the *poculum Consecrandum*, just as the *Talmud* names the *Calicem mixtum*, the Fruit of the Vine, and S. Basil the *calicem miscendum*.

X. After the many Pages of Dispute about *Κεράριον*, this Gentleman at last acknowledges that it most commonly implies a (b) Mixture. A Concession, which one would think

Gr. p. 76. sufficient to prevent any farther Repetitions upon that Controversy, and yet the Objector affirms it will stand us in no stead, unless we could prove farther, that it always and necessarily (i) signifies so. But under Favour,

(i) Ib. the proving part lies on his own Side. For Words will always be taken in their common and known Sense, 'till either the Context or the Subject be proved to require a different Interpretation. It is incumbent then upon the Answerer to give some Reason for translating out of general Custom, and deviating from the common and received Version of the Term. For as himself owns, we have Frequency of Usage, and Obviousness of Sense to weigh against Singularity and Rareness of Example. But the Truth is, this same Expression is applied to the same Cup, and explained to a Mixture of Wine and Water by many Writers of

(k) See Ap. to the Nes. p. 188. (k) Antiquity, which is more than sufficient to fix its Meaning, and obviate the Force of the Objector's Criticism, because it will be difficult to understand what any Man means, if Authors who speak in the same

Terms

Terms of the same Subject, are not to be understood in the same Sense.

And here we may observe, that these Gentlemen are embarrassed in their Discourses about *κεράννυμι*, and interpret it in Opposition to one another, and even to themselves. For the learned Author of the *No Reason*, allows it to signify a Mixture in all the cited Authorities, in which it (l) occurs. (l) *No Reason*. But the *No sufficient Reason*, in contradic- p. 5, 26.
tion to that Gentleman, declares it means pouring (m) INTO, and the *No just Grounds*, (m) N. S. contrary to him, contends for its being in- R. p. 51.
terpreted a pouring (n) OUT. And this is (n) *No just* the more wonderful, because we find the Gr. p. 73,
latter Interpretation insisted upon in the 75.
very Section in which he is vindicating the Authorities he had before produced for the (o) former. But the Reason of this Diver- (o) *Ib. p.*
sity of Translation is plain; pouring into is 75.
a Sense that is not compatible with the Passage in *S. Basil*, and wou'd have destroyed the Argument founded upon it. For if *κεράννυμι* signifies pouring into, then it is evident the *ποτήριον ἐν τῷ γενήματι τῆς ἀμπέλης*, can't signify a Cup of Wine, because, as this Author reasons, the Cup is called by that Name, before the *κίεσμα*, or Infusion of Wine is made. But to cut this Matter short, I can't see any Advantage this Gentleman can reap from the one Interpretation any more than the other, nor that it can any more signify pouring out than pouring into, unless he will assert, that at the eucharistick Institution there were two Cups of the Fruit of the Vine, one out of which, and the other into which the Wine was poured. For since our Saviour gave his Disciples

Disciples the Cup of the Fruit of the Vine, and this Argument asserts that the Liquor of that Cup was poured out of the Cup of the Fruit of the Vine, it is plain there must have been two Cups, or this Argument is wrong.

To the Objection concerning the Etymology of *κεδρυνος*, that it would as soon prove a Horn Vessel necessary as a Mixture, because it was derived from the Custom of drinking out of such a Vessel; it was answered first, that supposing our Saviour had used a Horn Cup, we could not from thence infer the Necessity of that Practice, because the Cup is no more than a Circumstance, nothing but the Receptacle of the sacramental Ingredients, that it receives the Elements, as the sacred Building does the Communicants, but can be no more proved necessary, than the Walls of the (p) Church. And 2dly, that we can draw no Argument from mere Etymology; and that Words are to be interpreted from the constant use of them in the best Authors, and to be understood according to the Sense of those Times, in which their Signification was settled and (q) determined. But to this the learned Objector has made no Reply, and because in another place it had been observ'd, that he had offer'd no one Reason, nor given any Instance to prove that they drank mere Wine out of the Horn Vessel, and that therefore the contrary might be the Practice, he answers that it has not been shown, that any ever granted that sort of Vessels to have been always (r) mixed. Nor was it his Opponent's Business, to show that they did. Such a Concession may reasonably be supposed, where no Argument is brought to the

(p) Nec.
P. 181.

(q) Ib.

(r) No just
Gr. p. 76.

the contrary. And this is all that was urged in the Appendix, where it is argued, that the contrary of drinking unmix'd Liquor out of the Horn Vessel, MIGHT for any thing that has been said, be the universal (s) Practice. (s) App. And indeed the constant and acknowledged Use of the Mixture among the Ancients, will go some way towards proving of it. However it is fair to suppose a Concession of an unsupported Doctrine, and that Supposition will be a good Argument, 'till the Doctrine be shewn to have some Reason or Authority to rely upon, which this Gentleman has not attempted to do in his Defence. There was then no Impropriety, no unwarrantable Liberty in the following Argument. If *κεράριον* be derived from the Custom of drinking out of a Vessel of Horn, and that Vessel was always mixed, then *κεράριον* must always denote a Mixture. For if our Author cannot shew that it was once used for pure Wine, the World will conclude that it was always used for a Mixture. But says the Answerer, without such a Concession [of the Horn Vessel's being always mixed] his Argument amounts only to this; if the Answerer will grant that nothing but what was mixed was drank out of a Vessel of Horn, then he must grant likewise, that what was drank out of such a Vessel, was (t) mixed. But whether this can by any Method in the World be the Sense of that Argument, the Reader will judge by comparing the Words as himself has quoted 'em, with the Representation here given of them. However we will examine a little into the Particulars of his Reasoning. Throw away the Concession, says he, and the Argument will stand thus:

If

(t) No just
Gr. p. 76.

If the Answerer will grant that the Horn was always mixed, then he must grant that the Horn was always mixed. That is, throw away the Concession, and that very Concession will be the antecedent in the Syllogism from which it is thrown away. For the uninterrupted Practice of mixing the Horn, was the Concession he finds fault with, and was urged in the Argument to which he ascribes it in almost the same Words, as he uses in the Argument from which he says it is rejected. *If that Vessel was always mixed* is the Expression in the former, and *if the Answerer will grant that nothing but what was mixed was drank out of it*, is his own in the latter. And to shew the Difference between these two with regard to the Point before us, will, I believe, require more than the Subtilty of a Schoolman. But 2dly, The Argument which this Gentleman has made up, as he says, without the Concession, consists of nothing else but the Concession; for the Subject of the Question was *κεκραυυται*, the Point to be proved, was that it signified a Mixture, the Reason upon which that Proof was founded, was because it was derived from the Custom of drinking out of a Horn Vessel, and the Concession was, that Vessels of that Sort were always mixed. The Objector undertakes to describe the Argument without the Concession, and gives us the following Syllogism for a Description. *If the Answerer will grant that nothing but what was mixed was drank out of a VESSEL OF HORN, then he must GRANT likewise, that what was drank out of such a VESSEL, was mixed.* Here is not
 one

one Word about *κατάφασις*, nothing about its Signification or Etymology, nor the least mention of any part of the Argument that it stands for, nor of any thing but the Concession, which alone of the whole Syllogism it was design'd to want. In a word, it represents all that it was brought to exclude, and excludes all that it was brought to represent.

To conclude: If we will take this Gentleman's Word, that he has rejected the Concession from his Account of his Opponent's Argument; his Description is so far from representing that Argument, that it wants both the Premises and the Conclusion. But if we interpret the Description according to the Sense of the Words, it is so far from rejecting the Concession, that it is a Stranger to every other Part of the Argument, is a mere Repetition of the Concession alone, and instead of exhibiting the Syllogism it is brought to represent, exhibits only one Proposition of it, and makes the Antecedent of his Author's *Hypothesis*, both the Antecedent and Consequent of his own Description. Such is the Effect of labouring for Reflection. But I proceed.

The next Argument was drawn from *Eustathius's* expounding *ἑστὶν* by *ἀναπόδειξιν*, and was opposed both from the Reason of the Thing, and the Authority of *Plutarch*. But against this the Answerer complains that *saying is one thing, and proving is (u) another*, (u) *No just* which is very true, but seems a little extraneous in the Place before us; for either it relates to the Observation from the Reason of the Thing, or to the Testimony urged

F from

Gr. p. 77.

from *Plutarch*. If to the first, it is illogical, because that is a (x) Negative, and to require Proof of a Negative, is changing Sides in an Argument, and altering the Rules of Dispute. If to the latter, it means nothing, because the Place was referr'd to from whence that Author's Testimony was extracted, and if the Objector dislikes the Interpretation, it is incumbent upon him to shew that the Words will bear a different Sense. However, let the Reader consider them, and pass his Judgment upon them. *Plutarch* having mentioned the different Opinions of *Niceratus*, *Socicles*, &c. neither of which prove any thing against the Mixture, proceeds to give his own in these Words, Ἀλλὰ μερακιῶδῃ τὴν φιλοτιμίαν αὐτῶν ἀπεφαινόν, δεδείκτων ὁμολογεῖν ἀκρατότερον εἰρηθεῖαι τὸ ζωέτερον, ὡς ἐν ἀτόπῳ τινὶ τὸ Ἀχιλλέως ἐσομένον, καθάπερ ὁ Ἀμφιπολίτης Ζώϊλος ὑπελάμβανε, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς τὸν Φοῖνικα καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα πρεσβυτέρους ὄντας εἰδὼς, καὶ ὕδαρσιν χαίροντας, ἀλλὰ ἀκρατότερον, καθάπερ οἱ ἄλλοι γέροντες, ἐπιτεῖναι κελδεῖα τὴν κερᾶσιν. That is, "But I told them their Dispute was childish, who were afraid to acknowledge that ζωέτερον was used for ἀκρατότερον, lest an Absurdity shou'd be imputed to *Achilles*, as *Zoilus* the *Amphipolitan* imagined, being ignorant that *Achilles*, knowing *Phoenix* and *Ulysses* to be elderly Men, that took no Pleasure in Wine over much diluted, but contrariwise in that which had less of the

(x) His expounding ζωεον by ἀκρατον, is NO Proof that he thought ζωέτερον excluded a Mixture, because ἀκρατότερον itself does not exclude it. *Nec. p. 187.*

“ Mixture, as other Old Men do, commands the Mixture to be made more strong.” This is *Plutarch’s* Determination, and is too clear to need a Comment. But the learned Answerer has another Objection. *Plutarch*, he says, testifies the use of the comparative Degree instead of the positive, to have been very (y) usual, and from (y) No just thence infers that *Homer* might write the one for the other. But what *Homer* might do, is not the Question. A Possibility, tho’ it may be sufficient to obviate an Argument founded upon the contrary Supposition, can never prove the Practice of which it is a Possibility. Nor does it follow, that because the Poet might write in that manner, therefore he did, and yet this was what our Author produced him for. Besides, the Reason of that Observation about the Degree of Comparison, was to shew that ζαρότερον might be used for ζαδον, but ζαδον is in that very Place explain’d by λυκεσθον, and must therefore, if it be of any Force, directly overthrow the Objection it was brought to prove. However let us suppose that *Homer* did use the Comparative for the Positive Degree, and by ζαδον mean an undiluted Liquor, what Advantage will this be to the Objector’s Cause? Cou’d not the Prince of Poets mean a Mixture by *misce merum*? Or is any Wine more than *merum*, till it is mixed? If it is not, the Objection can be of no Force. But I have before shewn from *Plutarch*, that a Mixture was meant by those Words, and need not therefore enlarge any farther upon the Point.

(y) No just
Gr. p. 77.

The Objector observes farther, that both *Plutarch* and *Eustathius* interpret *Λαγν* of *old Wine*, which I know not to what Purpose it can so well serve, as to shew that the former Citation from *Eustathius* signified nothing to the Point. For if *Λαγν* signifies *old Wine*, then it does not necessarily mean unmixed Wine. And if it does not necessarily mean unmixed Wine, then it does not prove the Question it was brought to prove.

In a Word, the Merits of the Cause are no ways concerned, whether *κεκραυυμ* may be applied to an unmixed Cup or not; for its usual and most natural Signification is allowed to be a Mixture, and I have before shewn that the Subject of which it is spoken, is not only capable of being mixed, but necessarily requires that (2.) Interpretation. And to this may be added, that it is next to impossible to conceive, that all the Fathers who spake of the Eucharistick Cup, shou'd unanimously agree in the Use of a Term, which most naturally signified a Mixture, and not one of them in any one Place, shou'd use the proper Term for an Infusion, if they had only design'd to inform us that our Saviour pour'd Wine into his Cup. This Gentleman then might have spared his Citations upon that Point, because if they were sufficient to prove all they were brought for, the Cause of the Mixture wou'd remain unhurt. But it may be worth observing, that the present Question between us, is, whether *κεκραυυμ* when joined with *ποσμεται*, does ever signify a mere Infusion? Yes, says the Answerer, if *Homer*, *Juvenal*, and *Martial* may pass for good (a) Authorities.

(1) p. 36,
37.

(2) No just
Gr. p. 79.

Authorities. But if the Reader will take
 the Trouble of comparing the 51 and 52
 Pages of the *No sufficient Reason*, and the
 79 Page of the *No just Grounds*, he will
 himself see that the Phrase of *ποτήριον ἐκμίγρον*,
 or *poculum miscuit*, does not once occur in
 any one of all the Passages. The Terms
misceo, and *κεράννυμι*, are there applied to the
 Liquor, not to the Cup; and though they
 may sometimes signify an Infusion when
 join'd with Wine, yet it may be question'd
 whether they will admit of such an Inter-
 pretation, when join'd with the Cup. For
 1st, We learn from one of the Instances
 which the Answerer has produced for his
 Exposition of *Misceo*, that, if that Term
 does signify an Infusion, then the Language
 is not *poculum miscere*, but *in poculo*, for
Martial does not say, *Hic scyphus est, qui*
miscetur, but *Hic scyphus est, in quo* (b) *misce-*
tur. And in *Homer*, it is not *μίστρον κεράννει*,
 but *οἶνον κεράννει μίστρον*. And 2^{dly}, Tho' *vinum*
infundere be intelligible Language, yet *po-*
culum infundere is somewhat obscure. And
 I believe neither *Homer* nor *Martial* wou'd
 understand us, if we were to tell them that
 it was the Custom to pour the Cup in or
 out. And yet the Passages in *Irenæus* so
 much disputed by our Author, and endea-
 vour'd to be overthrown by these Instances,
 are not *temperamentum vini*, but *calicis*, not
mixtio vini, but *calicis*, as may be seen in
 his own Account of (c) them. And in like (c) *Ib. p.*
 manner it is not *κεράνας οἶνον* in *S. Basil*, but 51.
κεράνας ποτήριον.

Before I dismiss this Head, it may be
 proper to examine what the learned Obje-
 ctor has offer'd from *Eustathius*, as a Reason
 why

why *μίσγον* cannot signify mixing in the Passage he has quoted from *Homer*, namely, because *Libations*, such as were there spoken of, (d) No just were made not of mixt, but pure undiluted (d) Gr. p. 79. *Wine*. But whether this Reason can be altogether depended upon, may be matter of Scruple, because *Homer* himself informs us more than once, that the Libation-Wine was the same that they drank for Pleasure and (e) Refreshment, and I need not prove that the Wine which they drank for Pleasure and Refreshment, was always mixed, nor that undiluted Wine was reckon'd a disreputable Drink.

But *νέκταρ* is also applied to *Nectar*, which, says the learned Answerer, I am pretty confident our Author will not so much as pretend was (f) Ib. p. drunk with (f) *Water*. But I don't know 79. what Reason this Gentleman has for supposing the contrary. And 'till he can produce some kind of Authority for interpreting it of an unmixed Liquor, I shall think my self obliged to forbear charging *Calypso's* Entertainment with an infamous Practice, and thinking that she and her Guest drank out of Custom and Rule.

The Observation from the Text in the *Proverbs*, that *ἐκέρασαν* must signify an Infusion, because it is joined with *εἰς κρατῆρα*, can be of no Service to our Author, because

(e) Ἀλλὰ μὲν ὄφρα κέ τοι μελιθεῖα οἶνον ἐνείκω,
ὧς σπείσῃς Διὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισι
Πρῶτον ἐπέβα δέ κ' αὐτὰς ὀνήσσαι, αἶκε πίνεσθαι. *Iliad.*
2. 259.

Ἀυτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπείσαντ', ἐπίον θ' ὅσον ἤθελε δῦμος *Iliad.*
1. 177.

him-

himself owns that *ἐκ* is often used in the same Sense with *ἐν*, and consequently that *ἐκέρας ἐκ κρατῆρα, ἢ ἐαυτῆς οἶνον*, is not an unprecedented Expression, for *she mixed her Wine in the Cup*. And as for the more or less Obviousness of the Phrase, that is no Objection, unless the Answerer can shew, that the Lxxii never made use of any but the most obvious Expressions. Besides that *ἐκέρας ἐκ κρατῆρα* is as easy a Composition for mixing in the Cup, as *καταλιπόντες ἐν τῷ στρατόπεδον* is for being left in the Camp, which yet is the Language of an eloquent (g) Historian. Nor is the other Argument better supported; for the same Principle that gave it Birth, will destroy it. Unless we understand the Words in our Sense, says this Gentleman, no Reason can be given for their [the Lxxii] inserting *ἐκ κρατῆρα*, which Words not being in the Hebrew, could be added with no other Intent, than to explain מִסְכָּה יָיִן in such a manner as best agreed with them. That is, מִסְכָּה being likely to be interpreted a Mixture, the Septuagint added *ἐκ κρατῆρα* in their Version, that it might be understood of an unmixed Infusion. But can it be imagined that they would have translated מִסְכָּה by *ἐκέρας*, an equivocal Term in the Hebrew, by as equivocal a Word in the Greek, if they had intended to ward against a Mixture? Cou'd they design to limit the Passage to an undiluted Cup by expressing it in such Terms, as our Author himself owns are capable of a contrary meaning? For it is allowed that *ἐκέρας ἐκ κρατῆρα* may mean the same as *ἐκέρας ἐν κρατῆρι*, and that is a Mixture. If this had been their Intention, they might have explain'd it

(g) Dion:
Halicarn.
apud Vi-
gerum De
Idiotismis
p. 327.

(h) No just
Gr. p. 80.

it by *מִשְׁכָּת* *kegrūci*, or other Words of an uncontroverted Sense. For the most unexceptionable Terms are required for Explanation, and to provide against Mistake. Since then the Words in the Hebrew do most naturally and properly signify a Mixture, and since the Septuagint have translated them in Language capable of that Signification, when they might have easily expressed them by Terms of an opposite Meaning, it is plain, I think, they had no Design to limit them to that Meaning, to which their Words do not limit them, nor to exclude a Mixture which their Words do not exclude. But let us see in what Sense they have always been taken; for this is the surest Method of determining the Dispute. The learned *Wagenseinus* tells us, that in an ancient Jewish MS. in his Hands there are these Words. The Term *מִשְׁכָּת* is to be explain'd from that Phrase in the Proverbs, Chap. ix. 2. *She hath mingled her Wine: Because in every מִשְׁכָּת there are a Number of Constitutions mix'd (i) together*: from whence it plainly appears that a Mixture was the received Signification of that Text; because if it had not, the appealing to it for interpreting a Word derived from *מִשְׁכָּת* to a Mixture, wou'd have been a manifest Absurdity. This Interpretation is also confirmed by the *Polyglot* Versions, which do all unanimously concur to explain it by *miscuit vinum*, and has besides all this the agreeing Authority of *Origen* and *S. Cyprian*, the first of which declares it to signify mixed (k) Wine, and the other expressly Wine mixed (l) with (l) Water.

(i) Suren.
Mish. tom.
3. Tract.
De uxore
adult. sus-
pec. §. 1.

(k) Hom.
xii in Je-
rem. xiii,
12.

(l) Ep. 63.

To the Objection that was offer'd against the Argument drawn from the Expression of ἀνεστος κατεσθόμενος in the Revelation, it is answered, that the Appendix tells us from Dr. Hammond, that the ἀνεστος κατεσθόμενος is a Cup (m) unmixed, &c. whereas neither the Appendix nor Dr. Hammond do either of them say any such thing, but the direct contrary. They do indeed observe, that the οὖνον ἀνεστος is a Cup unmixed with Water, &c. but then they do also observe, that κατεσθόμενος signifies a Mixture, and proves that same Cup to have been mixed, tho' not with Water, yet with those stupifying Infusions, which were ordinarily given to them that were put to Death, and which are used metaphorically in the Revelation for the astonishing Judgments of God. But, says this Gentleman, tho' it does not come quite up to what the Answerer contends for, yet it is no way reconcilable to that same Mixture, for which our Author is so zealous, and so is not to his (n) Purpose. Now the Citation was produced by the Author of *No sufficient Reason*, as an Instance of Κεράριον's being used in a different Sense from a Mixture, but this Gentleman owns it does not come quite up to what that Author contends for, that is, it is not an Instance of Κεράριον's being used in a different Sense from a Mixture, and consequently it is of no Service to the Cause it was brought to defend. Nor is it any Objection to urge the Irreconcilableness of this Mixture with that in dispute. For nothing can be concluded from hence, but that Κεράριον is applicable to other Mixtures besides that of Wine and Water, which No body ever que-

(m) No
just Gr.
p. 81.

(n) Ibid.

G

tion'd ;

tion'd; but I believe our Author will hardly ascribe any other Mixture to it, when applied to the Eucharistick Cup; if he should, the contrary will manifestly appear from the express mention of Wine and Water in *Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *S. Cyprian*; in the Councils of *Carthage, Orleans, Braga and Trullo*; in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and in the *Jerusalem, Alexandrian, Constantinopolitan, Ethiopick, and Nestorian Liturgies*, and in other Writers, Councils, and Forms of Publick Worship.

Theodorus Mopsuestenus comes next, but having answered our Author's Observations upon (o) *Origen*, I have also answered his Defence of this Writer's Testimony.

(o) p. 24.
(o) No just
Gr. p. 19.

The last Instance produced by the learned Answerer in Vindication of his Exposition of *Κεράννυμι*, is from a disputed Treatise of *S. Athanasius*, where speaking of the Benefits and Effect of the eucharistical Elements, he observes that the *Wine works Sobriety in the Soul of all the Participants, as if (Christ) had mixed his own Blood in the Cup; as ἐντὶ κέραν κέρασας τὸ εὐαγλίον αἷμα*. But here our

Author interprets *κέρασας* to an Infusion, and gives us the following Reasons why he can't allow it to signify a Mixture; First, because ἐντὶ with an Accusative Case, signifies

(p) Ib. p.
31.

most properly into, not (p) in, which proves nothing, unless it can be made appear that this Preposition always, as well as most properly, signifies into, which cannot, as is plain from *Psal. 118.* where *πεποιθήκασι ἐντὶ Κίεον* is used for *confidere in Domino*, to trust in the Lord. Secondly, because it cannot be literally and truly said of our Saviour, that

that he really mingled his (q) Blood, which is beside the Question, because tho' our Saviour can't be literally said to have mingled his Blood, yet he may in a figurative and spiritual Sense. Nor is the Passage, as it is interpreted in the Appendix, capable of any other Meaning. For to say that the Mixture of the Wine is as effectual to the Communicants, as if Christ's Blood was mixed in the Cup, plainly supposes that Blood to be not literally mingled. And yet these very Words are to be found in that Treatise: *The Wine, which represents the Blood of Christ, being mixed in the Cup of the Eucharist, is As effectual to the Conveyance of Sobriety and Virtue, As is that very Blood which is represented by it, was it self mixed in the Sacred* (r) (r) Appen. Vessel. Besides, we may observe, that if this P. 189.

Argument was true, it wou'd affect his own Exposition, as much as that which he opposes. For our Saviour can no more be said literally to have poured his own Blood into the (s) Cup, than to have mingled it. But 3dly, (s) No just Gr. p. 81. Whereas it was urged that ~~κεκραται~~ was plainly used by the Writer of this Treatise in a liturgical Sense, which had been proved to be that of a Mixture, he answers that he can by no Means admit of any such Proof having been (t) given. But this I shall refer to the Judgment of the Reader, and proceed to his Objection against the Explication of the Passage before us, from the Representation of Christ's Blood in the Wine, and that of the People in the Water mention'd by S. Cyprian. First, he says, *this Distinction does not come home to our* (u) Point. But what is our Point? The *κεκραται* of Christ's Blood, is the Subject of our Disagreement. That

(u) Ibid.

Term is own'd by our Author most naturally to signify a (x) Mixture; and S. Cyprian's Distinction plainly shews, that the Mixture of Christ's Blood was a Form of Speech well known to those Times. For he declares that the Mixture of the Wine with the Water, represented the Mixture of Christ's Blood with the People. But replies the learned Answerer, *there is no Foundation for it [the Distinction] in Scripture, where our Saviour speaks nothing of any Water in the* (y) *Eucharist*, the reverse of which I have shewn to be true more than once, and shall therefore only observe that, if what this Gentleman says was Fact, and S. Cyprian's Distinction had indeed no Foundation in Scripture, his Argument wou'd as well prove that S. Cyprian himself did not make use of it, as the Author of the Treatise ascribed to S. Athanasius. For S. Cyprian had the use of the Scriptures as well as that Writer, and which is more, appeals to them for that very Distinction, which the Objector pronounces (z) unscriptural. But to conclude, the learned Answerer tells us, that *there is not any Hint of such a Mixture in the Words produced. And to build upon a contrary Supposition, says he, is to beg the Question, not to prove* (a) *it*. Now I have not only supposed, but given my Reasons why *νεστος* must signify a Mixture, and I am satisfied this Gentleman will not interpret the Passage of Christ's real Blood, and consequently the Mixture of Christ's Blood must mean that of his representative Blood, which is the Eucharist. In short, let the World judge who must deserve the Charge of begging the Question, those who interpret *νεστος* according to its

(x) No just
Gr. p. 76.

(y) Ib.
p. 82.

(z) Ep. 63.

(a) No just
Gr. p. 82.

its natural and common Signification, by ecclesiastical Testimony and customary Language, or those who are defective in all these, whose Exposition has no Foundation, but an uncertain Criticism, nor any Argument for its Defence, that does not either err in the Matter, or fail in the Consequence. Thus much for *νεχρυνμι*, &c.

The learned Answerer proceeds to his Objections against the Testimony of *Justin Martyr*, and repeats his Assertion from Mr. *Daille*, that the Apostles did not give any the least Intimation of a Mixture. But that Father's own Words having been appeal'd to for the contrary Testimony, and the Terms *Wine and Water* inserted in the Translation upon the Authority of the Context, which expressly mentions those two Elements; he declares that Insertion to be groundless, and calls it *avowed Interpolation and (b) Corruption*. But under Favour, to unite the Text with the Context, and prefix the Subject to every Article of the Discourse to which it belongs, is not Interpolation, but is warranted by the Laws of Speech, and the Practice of all Expositors. Thus Bishop *Pearson* in his most useful and learned Exposition of the Creed, inserts the Words *I believe*, before the second and ninth Articles, &c. tho' they are not prefix'd to any but the first and eighth, and is so far from looking upon that Insertion to be Interpolation, that he declares it requisite for the Explication of the Faith, and affirms it to be *necessary and essential* to a right Confession, that the *Credo* which is but twice rehearsed in the Original, shou'd be believed to be virtually set at the Head of every Article. But
because

(b) No just
Gr. p. 83.

because this Gentleman is pleased to assert, that there is not the least Intimation of a Mixture in *Justin's* Account of the Institution, if his Words are left fairly to stand by (c) No just (c) themselves; I shall give the Reader the Gr. p. 83. whole Passage without any of the Insertions so unreasonably complain'd of, and leave the World to judge, whether I have done any thing more than the Context requires, and the Sense implies. Those, says the Martyr, whom we call Deacons, distribute the CONSECRATED BREAD, AND WINE, AND WATER, to all that are present, and carry it to the Absent. And THIS FOOD we call the Eucharist, WHICH it is not lawful for any to partake of, but such as believe our Doctrines to be true, are washed in the Laver of Regeneration, for the Remission of their Sins, and live according to Christ's Direction. For we do not receive IT as common Bread and common Drink, but as our Saviour Jesus Christ, who was incarnate by the Word of God, had Flesh and Blood for the sake of our Salvation: So we have been taught that THE FOOD by which our Flesh and Blood is nourished by its passing into our Substance, being sanctified by the Prayer of his Word, is the Flesh and Blood of that incarnate Jesus: For the Apostles in their Commentaries, which are called Gospels, have delivered this as the Command of Christ to them, who, when he had taken Bread, and given Thanks, said, Do this in Remembrance of me; This is my Body. And likewise when he had taken the Cup, and given Thanks, said, This is my Blood. Here the Apologist tells the Emperor, that Bread, and Wine, and Water, was the Food which was consecrated for the Communion of the Faithful, and which they called the Eucharist,

Eucharist; that they did not receive it as common Nourishment, but as the Body and Blood of Christ, and that the Reason of their ascribing that Change to it, was founded upon our Saviour's Language and Injunction recorded in the History of the Gospel. Now can it be imagined that he designed to exclude Water from Christ's Institution, when he appeals to it in Defence of the Christian Practice, which he expressly declares was to consecrate Bread and Wine, and Water? Did he think the Church had Power to institute a new Eucharist, and consecrate that into Christ's Body and Blood, which Christ had not ordained? If he did not, how cou'd he believe the Mixture an unnecessary Usage? That Mixture which he says was consecrated, was the Christian Eucharist, and was received as the Blood of Christ. 'Tis true indeed, the Martyr cites our Saviour's Words for the Proof of their receiving his Body and Blood, but this had been no Proof at all, if the Elements which the Christians partook of, had not been the same with those which our Lord denominated his Body and Blood; for Christ's calling Bread and Wine his Flesh and Blood, cou'd never shew that Bread, and Wine, and Water were so. When therefore the Apologist tells the Emperor that they received the Bread and Wine, and Water as the Body and Blood of Christ, and declares that this was done in virtue of our Saviour's Words, who called the instituted Bread and Cup by those Names; it is plain the instituted Cup consisted of Wine and Water; but this Gentleman sets the Martyr at Opposition against himself,

himself, and makes his Premises contain less than his Conclusion. For thus *S. Justin's* Argument wou'd stand in a Syllogism.

Whatsoever our Saviour instituted, that is his Body and Blood,

But he instituted Bread, and Wine, and Water,

Therefore Bread, and Wine, and Water, are his Body and Blood.

But the Argument which the *No just Grounds* has put into his Mouth to make him silent of the instituted Mixture, stands thus.

Whatsoever our Saviour instituted, that is his Body and Blood.

But our Saviour instituted Bread and Wine :

Therefore Bread and Wine, and Water, are his Body and Blood.

This, I say, is the plain Consequence of the Answerer's reasoning. For the Conclusion is evident from *Justin's* express Words ; who says, the Christians received Bread and Wine, and Water, not as common Food, but as that which they had been taught to be the Flesh and Blood of Christ ; and it is as evident that he appeals to the Institution for the Proof of this Proposition ; because he has no sooner mentioned it, than he subjoins the Scripture Precept, and cites the Apostolical History with a *For the Apostles have delivered, &c.* If then the Martyr pleads the Institution as a Proof of Bread and Wine and Water being Christ's Body and Blood, and that Institution consisted only of Bread and Wine, as this Gentleman asserts ; 'tis plain he pleads out of Rule, and infers more in the Consequent than

than is in the Antecedent. But this is a Charge far too weak to be fasten'd on the judicious Apologist; the Ornament of the Age he lived in; and the Admiration of all the Times that have followed him; a Man no less famous in the *Stadium* of the Philosophers, than in that of Christians; and as great a Master of Argument and *Deductions* as of sacred and profane Literature. And indeed, I believe the learned Answerer has himself better Sentiments of St. *Justin's* Writings, than to think them chargeable with these Absurdities, however, he has unawares reason'd the Martyr into them. But then it follows, that, if we cannot interpret the Apology to a consistent and reasonable Construction, without ascribing the Mixture to the Institution, *Justin Martyr* is a compleat Evidence not only of the Practice, but also of the Injunction of Water in the Eucharist.

To conclude, we may as well argue, that there is no Intimation of Wine in the Scripture-account of the Institution, as that there is no Intimation of a Mixture in that of St. *Justin*: For the one taken separately from the Context is as silent of the first, as the other taken in the same Manner is of the latter. The History of the Institution mentions nothing but the Cup; but the Context shews that Cup to have been the Fruit of the Vine; and in the same Manner *Justin's* Reference speaks only of the *οἶνος*; but the Context and Scope of his Argument shew that *οἶνος* to have been Wine and Water.

To the Reply to *Daille's* Objection our Author has given no manner of Answer, inasmuch as he has not been able to produce

duce any one Person that ever administred in unmixed Wine in *Justin's* Time; nor has taken any Notice of what was offered in Page 74. of the Necessity, to prove that *Justin Martyr* has inform'd us, that Bread, Wine, and Water, are the Matter of the Eucharistical Institution.

Irenaeus comes next, who affirms the Cup to be of the Creature, which being a singular Expression, is thought by the learned Objector to be unapplicable to the Plurality of Elements in the mixed Cup: But he might as well have urged the Impropriety of joining a Cup of Wine and Water with a Verb of the singular Number; tho' it is certain the Cup is but One, notwithstanding the Duplicity of its Ingredients. However, be this as it will, the Father's Words are as applicable to many as to one. For he is here proving Matter to be capable of Immortality, because the Cup, which represents our Lord's immortal Blood, is itself material or of the Creature; But sure Wine and Water are as much material as mere Wine, and consequently as applicable to the controverted Expression. But in Answer to this we are ask'd, Are not Wine and Water as properly representative of humane Blood, as the whole material World, of which they are (d) Parts? No Question of it. This is supposed in the Explanation just given; and which is more, the Argument does not once intimate the material World to be the Representation of human Blood, so that this Question is wholly beside the Point.

(d) No just
Gr. p. 85.

But 2dly, It was urged that *St. Paul* uses much the same Expression with *Irenaeus*, and tells us that the first Man was OF THE EARTH, as the Fathers say the Cup is OF THE CREA-

TYRE. But the Apostle explains his own Expression by *Earthly*, and consequently the Father's Expression is to be explained by (e) *created*. Now the Participle is as applicable to the plural as the singular Number, (e) App. P. 185. and by Consequence is as proper an Expression for Wine and Water, as for an undiluted Ingredient. The Answerer denies the Agreement of the Instances, and tells us that S. Paul speaks only of one single Person, the first Man, and so did not need a Plurality, to represent him, and besides had but one Earth to represent him by, and so could with no Propriety speak of (f) more. But how does this make any difference? Does Irenæus speak of any more than one single Cup? And does one single Cup need a Plurality to represent it, any more than one single Man? And again, is not Man a compound and mix'd Being, as much as a diluted Cup? if he be, as he certainly is, then the singular Number is as properly used of the one, as of the other. This has been already observed; tho' no Notice is taken of (g) it, (g) Nec. P. 186. and though it wou'd have entirely obviated this Part of the Objection. But neither is the other of any more Force: For Irenæus had but one Creation, as S. Paul had but one Earth; nor cou'd he with more Propriety, speak of a Plurality of Creations, than the Apostle of a Plurality of Earths. And yet I have before shewn, that the Father's Argument requires us to interpret *απὸ τῆς κτίσεως* of the whole Frame of Matter; and if I had not, this Gentleman has done it for me, in translating those Words of THE Creature, which he knows is a universal Expression, and ought to be taken in the Abstract.

But 3dly, To shorten the Matter, this very same *Irenæus* calls the whole Eucharistical Oblation the Creature. Does it therefore follow, that the Eucharist consisted of Bread only, or Wine only, &c. because he did not say of Creatures in the plural Number? This the Answerer will by no Means affirm. And yet the Father has these convincing Words. *We make our Oblations to him not as if he needed them, but as an Act of Homage and Acknowledgment, and for the Sanctification of the (h) CREATURE.* And a little before, *This Oblation [of the Bread and Cup] the Catholick Church alone makes to the Creator, offering to him with Thanksgiving of his (i) CREATURE.* As then he uses the singular number to express both Parts of the Eucharistical Institution, so might he use the same Number to denote both Parts of the Cup; and that he does so in Fact, is plain from the other Passages produced from him, which though our Author endeavours to deprive them of their natural and received Signification of a Mixture, cannot, as I have shewn, be understood in any other Sense, whether we regard the Subject, of which they are spoken, the concurrent Testimony of other Writers upon the Eucharist, or the (k) Language of Ecclesiastical Authors, such as is *Irenæus*.

(k) P. 36,
so. & ali-
bi hic &
Neces.

(b) Offerimus autem ei, non quasi indigenti, sed gratias agentes donationi ejus, & sanctificantes Creaturam, Lib 4. Cap 34.

(i) Hanc Oblationem Ecclesia sola pura offert Fabricatori, offerens ei cum Gratiarum actione ex Creatura ejus. Ib.

The Learned Answerer proceeds (l) to two other Passages of this Father, cited in the No-sufficient Reason, which are as follow. He promised to drink of the Fruit of the Vine with his Disciples; hereby shewing both the Earthly Inheritance, in which the new Fruit of the Vine is drank, and the Resurrection of the Flesh of his Disciples; and again, The Drink which is from the Vine, is not the Drink of the Spirit, but the Flesh. Now the Reason why no Notice was taken of these Citations, though the learned Objector thinks they might have been thought worth (m) Consideration, was, because they prove nothing; because none but Negative Arguments can be drawn from them, which at best are precarious, and when oppos'd to positive and express Evidence, such as are the Testimonies produced from Irenæus for the Mixture, have no manner of Force or Significancy. But says this Gentleman, they can mean nothing else but (n) Wine. Now supposing this Assertion to be true, what can be gathered from it? Or what Service can the Objector propose from the following Question, which he desires may be well considered? Can it be thought, that he (Irenæus) would have delivered himself in this Manner, if he had believed a Mixture of Water necessary with the (o) Wine? I answer by another Question. In the Acts of the Apostles we have an Account of the Solemnization of the (p) Eucharist, where nothing else is mentioned but Bread; would it then be either fair or true Reasoning to say, Can it be thought, that the Scriptures would have delivered themselves in this Manner, if they had thought the Cup necessary to be administered

(l) Nojust
Gr. p. 87.

(m) Ib.

(n) Ib.

(o) Ib.

(p) Aa.
20. 7.

stred with the Bread? No Protestant can think so: And yet the Cases are exactly parallel; for the sole mention of Wine can no more shew that to have been the whole Matter of the Cup, than the sole mention of Bread can shew that to have been the whole Matter of the Sactament. But this is not all, if we will allow *Irenæus* to speak for himself, and suffer the Father to be his own Interpreter, we shall find his Meaning very remote from the Construction our Author has put upon him, and the Words which he says can mean *nothing else but Wine*, plainly explain'd of a Mixture. This is evident from a Passage in the 36 Chapter of the same Book, where *Irenæus* is speaking of the same Subject with that of the Passage before us, where he refers to the same Text, and applies it to the same Argument, and yet is so far from expressing his Thoughts by mere Wine, that he uses the express Terms of the Mixture of the Cup. His Words are these. John foresaw the first Resurrection of the Just, and the Inheritance in the Kingdom of the Earth: And agreeably to him the Prophets prophesied of it: For this also was taught by our Lord when he promis'd that he would drink the Mix'd Cup new with his Disciples in his Kingdom. In this Passage, I say, and that produced by the No-sufficient Reason the Father plainly speaks of the same Subject, which is the Promise of Christ to his Disciples, and he as plainly refers in both to that Text in S. Matthew, *I will not drink henceforth of this Fruit of the Vine, untill that Day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom.* Nor can any one doubt but he applies it to the same Argument, who

(q) Matt.
26. 29.

who shall consider that in both Places he makes it a Prophecy of the Resurrection. Since then *Irenæus* treats in both Passages of the same Cup, in the same View, and with Regard to the same Circumstances, 'tis certain he cou'd not mean to exclude Water from the Answerer's Quotation, which is so visibly included in this, because that wou'd make the same Cup to be at the same Time mix'd and unmix'd. And it is equally certain that our Author's Passages must be interpreted by this, not this by them, because though *σιν* may be explained to a Mixture, yet cannot a Mixture to mere Wine; though there may be Water in a Cup of Wine, there cannot be undiluted Wine in a mix'd Cup. I take no Notice here of the Objection about the Meaning of the Term *Mixtio*, because I have done that before, and because all Commentators interpret it of a Mixture.

To what was offer'd concerning the Ebionitish Cup, this Gentleman has given no Answer, and therefore it may be sufficient to refer to the *Necessity of an* (r) *Alteration.* (r) *Nec.* He says indeed the Argument is supported p. 23. & by uncertain Criticisms; but he does not seq. produce one Reason for his Assertion, and the contrary will easily appear to the Reader, who will find those Criticisms confirm'd by Authority, and shewn to be agreeable to *Irenæus's* Reasoning.

The Father, 'tis true, argues for the Wine, not the Water, but this was accounted for by observing, that the Ebionites did not reject the Water, but the Wine, and therefore needed no Argument, where they were already (s) convinced. To which the Answer-

er replies : Yet that he might set them RIGHT IN THEIR NOTIONS, had the Father been truly of our Author's Opinion, it would not have been amiss to have told them, not only that they erred in not using Wine, but that both Wine and Water were absolutely necessary. — And we may reasonably suppose he would have said so ; and since he did not, it is a just Conclusion that therefore he did not look upon the Water as equally (t) necessary. That is, (t) No just Gr. p. 88. we may reasonably suppose the Father would have been solicitous about setting them right in a Notion, which they were not wrong in. For they had right Conceptions of the Water, and a consonant Practice. Their Error lay only in the disuse of the Wine, and consequently that alone could be the Subject of Irenæus's Reproof. But this, says the learned Objector, is as much as to say, the Father reprov'd them for not using Wine in the Eucharist ; therefore all else are necessarily and indispensably obliged to use Water with their (u) Wine. And if it be as much as this, no Body, I believe, desires more : For the Consequence is fairly justifiable, how much soever it may suffer in this Situation. The Ebionites, though they rejected the Wine, yet they retain'd the Water, and consequently believed it necessary, both because they look'd upon it as the Representation of our Saviour's Humanity, and also because they have never been charged with the Calvinistical Opinion of making it indifferent what Liquor be us'd in the Eucharistical Administration. But Irenæus does not once intimate that they were erroneous in this Point, he fixes no guilt upon this Sentiment ; lays no Charge against either their Doctrine or Practice,

with

with Regard to the Water, which yet he certainly wou'd have done, if he had believed them Criminal, or thought the Water an unnecessary Ingredient. For to add to an Institution, as those certainly do, who make an uninstituted Usage essential, is as great a Sacrilege, as to detract from it, and calls for as severe a Reproof. Since then the Father has reprehended their Disuse of the Wine, because it detracted from the Matter of the Cup, but has found no Fault with their Opinion of the Essentiality of the Water, which yet wou'd have been as great an Error had it not been true; it is plain he thought it essential too, and consequently believed every Body necessarily and indispensably obliged to use it.

The Answerer goes on and repeats the Objection about *Commixtio*, but has not offered one Reason against the Answer that was given to it in the Appendix. He observes indeed that according to the Interpretation there given of it, *Irenaeus* is made to speak of a Mixture, that was indisputably (x) unmix'd. But this, tho' it may be an Amusement, is not an Argument. For I have shewn that the Author of the *No sufficient Reason* does himself speak of a Church that is indisputably no Church; and that Protestants call the Administration of the Bread without the Cup in the Romish Communion, the Sacrament, tho' it is indisputably no Sacrament, because it wants an essential and constituent Part of the (y) Institution; and that therefore this way of speaking is warranted by Custom and Example. But he asks, whether the Author of the Appendix be so very sure he is in the Right, that a Man may safely venture his Salvation

(*) No just Gr. p. 89.

(y) App. p. 193. 194.

(2) No just
Gr. p. 89.

tion upon (z) it? In Answer to which I do assure him I shall always venture my Salvation rather upon the force of Evidence than the want of it; rather upon the highest Probability, than the Contrary; and consequently rather upon an Interpretation, that is founded upon the Context of the Passage to which it belongs, and supported by common Usage, and customary Expression, than an Interpretation, that is opposite to the Context; and instead of explaining the Sentence, in which it's used, construes away its Meaning, and renders it unintelligible.

Before we leave this Point, we may observe, that *Eusebius* places the *Ebionites* in the Age of *Cerinthus*, who was contemporary with S. (a) *John*, which affords us a Testimony of the Mixture even in the Apostolical Age. For since the *Ebionites*, who lived in S. *John's* Time rejected the Wine from the Eucharistick Cup, and retain'd the Water; 'tis plain both those Ingredients were used by the Catholick Church, before the Death of that Apostle; for they could not reject that from the Cup, which was not Part of it, nor retain a Usage, that had never been in Practice.

We come now to *Clemens Alexandrinus* against whose Testimony it is objected 1st. That there is an unaccountable Transition from the Nominative to the Genitive Case, from *ὁ λόγος* to *τοῦ λόγου*, without any appearance of Reason for it. Which, says the learned Answerer, makes the Words not easily intelligible as our Author supposes them to be.

(3) No just
Gr. p. 90.

to (b) be. But what Rule of Grammar does this Transition contradict? Cannot the same Word be the Nominative Case

the Verb in one Paragraph, and the Genitive put absolute in another? This is too well known to all that are acquainted with the Rudiments of the Greek Tongue, to be denied. And yet this is all that S. Clement does. This, says he, was a Sign unto those, who from a State of wandering have been led into a State of Rest, namely the great Cluster, the Logos, that was pressed for us, it being the Will of the Logos (*ἐδεήσατο τοῦ λόγου*) that the Blood of the Grape shou'd be mixed with Water, as his Blood is mixed with (c) Salvation. In like Manner if one shou'd say, This was a Sign unto those, who from the Bondage of Judaism were to be brought into the Liberty of the Sons of God, namely the Cup of Wisdom, the mix'd Wine in the Proverbs; mixed Wine being that which our Saviour call'd his Blood. Here no Body, I believe, wou'd complain of the Difficulty of the Construction, nor look upon the Words as not easily intelligible, and yet they are dispos'd in the same Order with S. Clement's, and exhibit the same Transition from mix'd Wine in the Nominative Case to mix'd Wine in the Ablative.

But 2dly, it is urged that the more natural Construction of the Words seems to be, the Logos being willing to be mixt with the Water of the Blood of the (d) Grape. But sure that Construction cannot be natural, that interprets the Words out of all Meaning and Sense, as this does. The Case is plainly this. Since the *ὁ λόγος* is indisputably put in apposition with the *βότρυς* in the Words immediately preceding the Citation before us, there is a very great Presumption that the same apposition shou'd be observed in the *λόγος* and the *ἀμύαλος τῆς σαρκὸς*, as *Hermetus* has done

(c) Clem.
Pæda.
Lib. 11.
Cap. 2.
P. 65.

(d) No just
Gr. p. 90.

in his Translation of this Father, for it is evident that both places speak of the Grape that represents the Logos, (tho' the one be Typical, and the other Sacramental,) and consequently since they speak of the same thing, it is reasonable to suppose they have the same Expression. But this interpretation I have elsewhere shewn to amount to a plain Declaration, that the Mixture was the Will of Christ, and have also proved our Authors Translation to be inconsistent with the Context, and destructive of S. Clement's meaning and design, which therefore is so far from being an Objection to what has been said upon this Father, that it is nothing more than a Repetition of an Objection already obviated in that very Discourse, to which it is brought as an (e) Answer.

(e) Necess.
p. 39, 40,
& seq.

In the 3d place it is objected, that *these Words, The Logos, the Blood of the Grape ordering that itself should be mixed with Water, are an undeniable intimation that this Father did not apprehend the Blood of the Grape to mean any thing more than pure Wine*, which is beside the purpose, unless the Answerer could shew that S. Clement was tyed up to the Jewish Idiom, and when he he was writing to the Greeks was bound to talk Hebrew. There is no Question but *the Blood of the Grape means pure Wine among the Greeks*. And it is pretty plain from what has been said, that *the Fruit of the Vine means a Mixture among the Jews*; from whence it follows, that what in the Language of the latter, which our Lord spoke, is called *פרי הגפן*; in that of the former, which S. Clement spoke, is called *αἷμα τῆς σαφύλης ὁδοῦ κεκραμένον*.

(f) No just
Gr, p. 90.

The 4th Objection is, that Clements in the last

last Words of the Citation, professes the Mixture in the Eucharist to be (not of Wine and Water, but) of the Drink and the (g) Logos. (g) No just But under favour Clemens professes no such thing, but the direct contrary. He says indeed, that the Mixture of the Drink and the Logos, is named the Eucharist, but then he had expressly told us but three lines before, that that Drink was Wine mixed with Water, and had also explain'd what he meant by the mixture of the Logos, namely the Union of the Spirit with the Elements upon Consecration; the Spirit being as he says, the Life giving Principle of the Logos: The Mixture then of the Eucharistical Matter was that of Wine and Water, tho' the Conjunction of the Logos with, or the Descent of the Spirit upon that Matter made it the Eucharist.

The 5th. Objection is against the Explanation that is given of S. Clement's Testimony in the Necessity of an Alteration. "I will oblige myself, (says this Gentleman) to give up the Cause if this latter Clause, so was the Blood of the Logos exhausted on the Cross, that it might also be mixed with Water, and be the Christian Banquet: For this was his own Institution, be to be found in what Clemens (h) says." And indeed I shall willingly confess that the words are not to be found there. No more are the words of Dr. Hammond's Comment upon the New Testament to be found in the Text, nor the words of any Paraphrase upon the Lords Prayer to be found in that Prayer. But yet what is meant by those Words is allowed to be contain'd both in the one and the other. In the same manner, though the Interpretation objected against consists of more Words

Words (as indeed it wou'd hardly be an interpretation if it did not) than the Passage of which it is an Interpretation, yet is the Substance and Meaning of it contain'd in that Passage. For Instance, S. Clement declares that the great Cluster (which was brought from Canaan by Joshua, &c.) was a Type of the Logos who was pressed for us. But how or when was the Logos pressed for us but upon the Cross? Or how cou'd the Pressure of the Juice out of the Grape prefigure the Pressure of the Logos, unless by that Pressure the Blood of the Logos was exhausted? But the Juice of the Grape was pressed out to be added to the Jewish Water, and to be the Drink in the Land of Canaan. How then cou'd the exhausted Blood of the Logos answer up to the Type, unless that also was mixed with Water, and made the Christian Drink in the new Dispensation? Nay the Father does in almost so many Words testify this to be his Meaning. For he has no sooner declared the Pressure of the Logos to be the Proto-type of the Canaanitish Grape, than he subjoins the following Account of that in which the Proto-type consisted, namely, that it was the Will of the Logos that himself represented by the Blood of the Grape should be mixed with Water. But if the Mixture was the Will of the Logos, it was doubtless his Institution, because his Will is a Law. If then S. Clement does testify that the Logos was pressed (or his Blood exhausted) for us; if he does give this Reason for that Pressure, that the same Blood under the Symbol of the Grape shou'd be mix'd with Water, and

and does affirm that Mixture to have been the Will (which is the Institution) of the Logos, as I have just shewn he does, then it is plain that the Clause our Author so much complains of, is to be found tho' not verbatim, yet in sum and effect in the *Pedagogue*, from which it is quoted and explained. I pass by the Four Lines of Reflection as nothing to the Argument.

In the 6th Place says the Objector, *It being the Humanity of our Saviour and his Sufferings in it, that the Mixture is designed to represent, I would gladly be taught, where this Humanity is called the λόγος, or how it comes to be* (i) *so.* This interpretation is a little unexpected, an Interpretation, that depresses the

(i) No just
Gr. p. 92

Dignity of the Institution, vacates the Design of the Incarnation, and destroys the Merit and Effect of our Redemption. First it depresses the Dignity of the Institution, because no Representation can convey more than the Thing represented; and consequently the Eucharist, if it be a Representation of the mere Humanity of Christ, cannot convey to us the Merits of the Godhead. Secondly, it vacates the Design of the Incarnation; for it was the Insufficiency of human Nature to atone for itself, that call'd down the Godhead from Heaven, and made the Deity join itself to a Creature. But if the mere Humanity of Christ could merit eternal Life for us, as it must, if the Eucharist, which applies that Merit to us, be nothing more than a Representation of our Lord's Humanity, then was the Union of the Godhead with Man an unnecessary Dispensation, and the eternal Logos was made incarnate to expiate a Crime that did not require an eternal Mediator.

diator. But Thirdly it destroys the Merits and Effect of our Redemption, because it makes the human Nature as distinct from the Godhead, to have been all that satisfied for our Sin. For since the Eucharist was instituted to apply to us the Satisfaction that Christ has made for us; if the Eucharist be only a Representation of the human Nature, it is evident the human Nature only has satisfied for us. But if the human Nature only has satisfied for us, then are we yet in a State of Irreconciliation, and unredeemed. For it is impossible for the Creature to merit of the Creator, much more to merit the Blessings forfeited by Transgression; and it is contrary to Reason to suppose that a Crime committed against an infinite Being shou'd be capable of being expiated by any Thing less than an infinite Mediator. These are the Consequences of the Sixth Objection, and as I doubt not but the learned Answerer will disown the Doctrine they contain, so he must also disown the Principle from which they necessarily flow, and acknowledge that the Mixture is a Representation not only of the Humanity, but also of the Divine Nature of Christ. And indeed it is plain from *Irenæus*, and others, that this was the Doctrine of the ancient Church, as is particularly shewn in the Answer to Mr. Drake, where this very *S. Clement*, of whom we are speaking, is compared with *Irenæus*, and shewn to have the same Sentiments about the Representation of the Two Natures

(k) Resp. in the Mixture, with that (k) Father.

ad Conc.

P. 30.

The

The last Objection is drawn from a supposed Darkness of several other Expressions in the Citation, and observes that it is no easy task to shew how the Blood of Christ is mixed with Salvation, after the same manner that the Wine and Water are mixed together, nor how it appears he had *duos* *quos*, two sorts of Blood, one whereby we are redeemed from Corruption, and another wherewith we are anointed; nor again how to partake of our Lords Immortality is to drink his (1) Blood. (1) No just
 To the first I answer, that if Salvation be the consequence of Remission of Sins, and Remission of Sins be obtain'd by Christ's Blood, as the Scripture says it is, then may Christ's Blood be properly enough said to be mixed with Salvation. Nor is there any Necessity to interpret S. Clement, as if he contended for an Agreement in the manner of the Mixture, since it appears to have been his Design only to shew that the Wine represented Christ, and the Water Salvation or Men the object of it. To the second I answer, that the Father's Words, had he been an Advocate for Transubstantiation, wou'd indeed have been very dark and mysterious, but they cannot be so if they be taken in a Primitive and Protestant Sense, such as I am confident this Gentleman is willing to take them in. For it is certain that it was the carnal Blood of our Lord that was shed on the Cross, and it is as certain that the Consecrated Cup, which the Scriptures and the Church of England declare to be our Lord's Blood, is not his carnal Blood, and consequently it must be his Spiritual. There are plainly then two sorts of Blood, one Carnal, and the other Spiritual. But neither is the other part of the

(m) The
Prayer
next be-
fore the
Consecra-
tion Prayer.

(n) John
6. 54.

(o) 1 Tim.
6. 16.

(p) No just
Gr. p. 93.

Proposition less evident. For it is allowed that our Saviour wrought our Redemption by shedding his carnal Blood upon the Cross; consequently *by the carnal Blood we are re-deem'd from Death*, and the *Common-Prayer-Book* affirms, that our Souls are washed by the Eucharistical or Spiritual (m) Blood, and I think I need not prove that washing and anointing mean the same thing, when spoken of the same Subject, from whence it clearly follows, that *with the Spiritual Blood we are anointed*. To the third and last I answer, that it is the Doctrine both of the Church of *England*, and the New Testament, that the Participation of the Eucharist entitles us to eternal Life. For thus in the Prayer of Thanksgiving after the Communion, God is praised for having made the Communicants by a due Reception of the holy Mysteries *Heirs through hope of his everlasting Kingdom*. And our Saviour himself testifies, that *he that eats his flesh, and drinks his blood, has eternal (n) life*. But if the Communion of the Eucharist conveys to us eternal Life, it certainly *makes us partakers of Christs immortality*, because *he only (o) has (o) immortality*.

The following Testimonies do neither of them exclude the Water, or mention it, and do therefore neither prove nor disprove any thing. Even the last of them, which says *that what was blessed was (p) Wine*, does not tell us whether that Wine was mixed or un-mixed, and the former may be thought probable from the Scope of the Discourse, from whence it is cited, which is to recommend Temperance, and from the Method which it prescribes in order to that, which

is to mix Water with the (q) Wine. In a word, since the Expression is capable of signifying a Mixture, all the Rules of Interpretation in the World require that it shou'd be explain'd by the exprefs mention of Wine and Water in the Passage, to which it is brought as an Objection, and not that Passage by this Expression, because *οἶνος* may and often does denote a Mixture, but Wine and Water never did nor can denote mere Wine.

Against S. Cyprian's Testimony it is urged, 1st. That when he says the Cup of the Lord is not Water alone, nor Wine alone, it is only meant with regard to his Scheme of the Representation of the People in the Water, and of the Blood of Christ in the (r) Wine. And 2^{dly}, That he expressly affirms that Christ offer'd to God the Father the same Sacrifice that *Melchisedech* had offer'd before (s) him. And 3^{dly}, That he declares the Wine to be more necessary than the (t) Water. To the first I answer in short, that S. Cyprian did not think his Scheme cou'd make that to be the Cup of the Lord, which Christ had not instituted, and cou'd not therefore found the Necessity of the Mixture upon that Scheme, unless he had believed it to have been so by Institution, but if he believed it to be so by Institution; then is he an Evidence that *neither Water without Wine, nor Wine without Water, is the instituted Cup of the Lord*, which is all he was produced for. But besides he declares the Lord's Cup cannot be consecrated

K 2

without

(q) *Κίενασαι δὲ αἶνον τῷ ὕδατι ὥς πλείω τὸν οἶνον.*
Lib. 2. c. 20.

without both Wine and (u) Water. And sure nothing can be necessary to, or capable of receiving the Eucharistical Consecration, but what was ordained by Christ for that Purpose. I might here vindicate S. Cyprian's Notion, as agreeable to the Sentiments of the Catholick Church, and the Reason and Design of the Institution, but because the Argument does not require it, and this Treatise is already swoln beyond what I expected, I shall content myself with proceeding to the second Objection. And here it may be sufficient to repeat an Answer long since given to the same Objection, that 'tis most probable Melchisedeck offer'd what was generally drank in those warm Cli-

(x) Def. p. 31.

(y) Part I. p. 84.

(z) Part I. p. 21, 22.

mates, which was and is still Wine (x) diluted. For though there was a reply made to it in the No sufficient (y) Reason, yet will the Reader meet with a Satisfactory Answer to that Reply in the *Vindication of the (z) Defense*. And if it was not so, the Words in the Proverbs, to which S. Cyprian refers as a Prophecy of the Eucharistical Institution wou'd entirely overthrow all that can be drawn from the *Melchisedeckian Type*; for he only says that *Melchisedeck offer'd Wine*, without limiting the Expression to pure or diluted Wine; But when he speaks of the other, his Words are plain and positive, expressly affirming, that Wisdom prophetically declares the Cup of the Lord to be mixed with Wine and (a) Water. To the

(u) In SANCTIFICANDO Calice Domini offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum Ep. 83.

(a) Calicem Domini AQUA ET VINO MIXTUM prophetica voce denunciat. 1b.

the third and last Objection I answer, that either this Argument proves the *Wine* to be the Cup of the Lord, or it does not: If it does, then it is plainly used by S. Cyprian as an Argument *ad hominem*, and not as a Declaration of his own Doctrine, because he affirms the contrary of his own Sentiments, and testifies in express Terms, that Wine without Water is not the Cup of the Lord. If it does not prove the *Wine* to be the Cup of the Lord, then it does not destroy the Essentiality of the Water. The Case is plainly this, S. Cyprian argues, that supposing the *Aquarian* Principle to be right, *viz.* that one part of the Cup might be omitted, then that Omission ought rather to fall upon the Water than the Wine, but since the Principle belonged only to the *Aquarians*, 'tis plain the Consequence affects none but them; since S. Cyprian disallowed the Supposition, he cannot be charged with the Doctrine founded upon it. There is then no Contradiction between this Father and the Author of the Appendix, since he allows no terms of dispensation with the Essentials of a Sacrament, professes no belief of an inequality in the different Ingredients of the Cup, and delivers no Doctrine as his own, which does not charge the Oblation of pure Wine or pure Water, with Defect and (b) Imperfection. (b) Ep. 63.

Before I leave S. Cyprian, it may be proper to apprize the Reader that the two Passages of this Father, which the Objector says, the Appendix has by a sort of Artifice tacked together, are plainly distinguishable in the Text, where the Conjunction is used with a design to Connect the latter

ter Citation not to the former, but to *S. Cyprian declares*, to which they both belong; besides that the Citation in the Margin, where they are distinguished both in Situation and Sense, and the reference to the Original are sufficient proofs of this Gentleman's mistake.

To what the Objector has said upon the *Easter-Controversy*, it may be a sufficient Answer to refer to the (e) Appendix, for he has neither shown that the Question with the *No-Reason* was not about what the Apostles did, nor that the Contentions and Strifes about the Traditionary time of keeping *Easter*, are any proof of the uncertainty of Tradition, because both contending Parties are reasonably supposed to have had Truth on their side, and surely to have had Truth on their side is no Argument of their being mistaken, nor is an instance of uncorrupted Tradition a proof of the uncertainty of it.

The Objection from the *Millennial Tradition* has been already (d) answered in the *Necessity*, tho' the Appendix to that Book takes no Notice of it, and indeed the putting it into plain Language wou'd itself be an answer to it, for it is impossible to argue from the contradicted Tradition of the *Millennium* to the uncontradicted Tradition of the Mixture, as this Gentleman does, who makes the supposed Error of the *Millenaries*, who were opposed by their Brethren, a proof that *S. Cyprian* might be mistaken in his Tradition for the Mixture, in which he was not opposed by his

(e) No just (e) Brethren.

Gr. p. 100.

The Argument about the Spurious Writings of Antiquity destroys itself, because

un-

unless we can depend upon the certainty of Tradition, we cannot be sure those Writings were spurious, and if we can depend upon the certainty of Tradition, then we may be sure of the Necessity of the Mixture, which is testified by Tradition; and as for *the Holy Kifs, the Love Feasts, &c.* they have been long since shewn unserviceable to the Argument they are brought to prove, because they are only Matters of external Performance, and there can be no reasoning from Circumstance to Substance, from a ceremonious Usage, to the Ingredients of the Cup, and the Constituents of an (f) Institution.

(f) Def. p. 22.

Against what was said concerning the communicating of Infants, the learned Answerer has nothing to object, and therefore requires no reply. He says indeed that the Mixture is an indifferent Practice, but having proved the contrary, I shall wave Repetition.

In the same Page we meet with a complaint that the Authors of *the Defense* and *the Appendix* have neither of them taken notice of the following Argument in the *No Reason*. Had our Saviour said upon the giving the Cup, *I will drink no more of this Water, &c.* every one would immediately have understood the Cup to be filled with Water and to have no Wine in it. Why then, when he says, he will drink no more of this Fruit of the Vine, should we not likewise understand him to mean, that it was Wine without (g) Water?

(g) No just

I answer, because Water was never used to express a Mixture, whereas it has been proved, that the Jews mean nothing else but a Mixture by the Fruit of the Vine; because the one denotes unmixed Water, and

Gr. p. 101.

and the other Wine diluted with Water.

The Learned Answerer proceeds to a second Complaint, and tells us, that the last Words of the *Melchisedeckian* Plea in the *No-Reason* have had no reply made to (b) them. Now what that Author says is this, that he is not sure the Jewish Cup was mixed in our Saviour's time, and that the Scripture assures us he did not institute his Eucharist before they had done (i) eating. The first I have answer'd in the former part of this Treatise, and the second is beside the Question, because the Scripture assures us that Christ instituted his Eucharist at the Paschal Supper, whether it was before or after they had done eating, matters not. Besides S. Matthew testifies that our Lord called the Eucharistick Cup by the very same name of the Fruit of the (k) Vine, by which S. Luke witnesses that he called the Paschal (l) Cup, which demonstrably shews that they both consisted of the same Ingredients.

(b) Ib. 102.
(i) Ib.
(k) cap. 26.
29.
(l) cap. 22.
18.

To S. Jerome's calling Bread and Wine a simple and pure Sacrifice, it was answered, that he only opposes those Terms to the carnal and bloody Sacrifices of the Jews, and consequently means no more by them than a spiritual and unbloody Sacrifice, and I wou'd ask this Gentleman whether Bread and diluted Wine cannot be called a simple and pure Sacrifice, because if they can, as they certainly can, then are these Words no manner of proof against the Mixture.

The Objection against the genuineness of this Father's Commentary on S. Mark I find to be just, and shall therefore make no farther use of it. Nor indeed is it needed, since the Doctrine cited from him

him is no ways opposite to that of the Mixture.

As for the mystical Interpretation of the Mixture by S. Athanasius, cited from *L'Arroque*, it is to be found in the *English Edition* of that Author by *Jos. Walker*, Printed at London, 1684, p. 5. and the reference is made to *Athanas.* in *Psal.* 74. *apud Auctuar. Bibl. Patr. Combesian.* tom. 2. p. 435.

To the Objection from *Eusebius's Declaration*, that *Melchisedeck blessed Abraham with Bread and Wine only*, it was replied, that he used the term *only*, not to exclude Water, but the Sacrifices of Brutes; and for the Truth of this Construction, the Words of the Context were appealed to. But the learned Answerer finds fault with the Position of the Words in the Translation, and tells us, that they stand thus in *Eusebius*. *He blessed Abraham with Wine only and Bread*, where, says he, *it is visible he does not use the plural μόνων, as relating to both the Bread and the Wine, nor does he say adverbially μόνον, only with Bread and (m) Wine.* But this is no Objection, because the Greek Syntax does by no means require that an Adjective relating to two Substantives, should be put in the plural Number, or be expressed by the Adverb. Nay it not only allows the Conjunction to couple the same Adjective to different Substantives, as here the *καί* joins the *μόνον* to *οἶνον* and *ἄρτον*, but even to unite different Numbers and Genders, as in that of *Aristotle*, *ὡς οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ Πλάτων ἔλεγον*, and that of *Homer*, *ἐπὶ λαῷ φέρον ἀνέμους τε καὶ ὕδωρ*.

The learned Objector puts us in mind also that S. *Augustin* was cited in the same (n) Page. But since that Citation spoke (n)ly to

L

only

only of *Melchisedeck's* Sacrifice being a Type of the Eucharist, and the reasoning from that Type had before been shewn to be no ways prejudicial to the Doctrine of the (a) Mixture, it was thought unnecessary to repeat the Argument.

(o) Necess.
p. 76.

To the Objections against the *Trullan* Canon, it may suffice to observe 1st. That the Answerer acknowledges they are founded only upon the latter part of it taken separately from the (p) rest, which acknowledgment is itself a full Answer to all that has been said upon the matter. For if the Mixture cannot be excluded from the Citation, but by excluding the Context, it is plain the Canon gives Testimony for the Mixture, because it will be impossible to know the meaning of any Author, if we may neglect the Context in the Interpretation, and reason from a partial reference.

(p) No just
Gr. p. 105.

(q) Necess.
p. 204.

This wou'd make not only the Fathers, but the Scriptures of no use, and as I have elsewhere (q) observed, wou'd reduce the fourth Commandment to the Absurdity of decreeing that every Man should abstain from Work upon the Sabbath Day, but his Son and his Daughter, and his Servant shou'd not. For if because the *and* is not repeated in the Canon, we must interpret the latter part of the Decree affirmatively, by the same reasoning the *not* in the Commandment being unrepeated, we must construe all but the first Article affirmatively. Nor is it any Objection to say, that the Conjunction *will not make a negative and an affirmative, to have both the same* (r) *Signification*, because the addition of a negative Particle will make a negative of an affirmative, and consequently the Conjunction, which unites

(r) No just
Gr. p. 107.

unites the *not* to the different parts of the Commandment, will make those parts negative, though without that Connection they might be affirmative. But if of the Commandment, which this Gentleman acknowledges, then also of the Canon, which he does not acknowledge. For *quæ eidem sunt equalia, inter se sunt equalia.*

But 2dly, it is acknowledged on all sides, that the *Trullan* Fathers deliver themselves clearly in the first part of the Canon, and how much soever the Decree may be controverted, the Language of the preamble is open and indisputable. Whatsoever Declaration then we find there in relation to the Mixture, that is certainly the Testimony of the *Constantinopolitan* Synod. But we find the following Affirmations. 1st. That the *Armenian* Practice of offering unmixed Wine was founded upon ignorance and mistake. 2dly, That *S. Chrysostom* directed the Mixture of Water with Wine in his own Church. 3dly, That it was of Divine Appointment [*θεοδοσιος πατρις*]. 4thly, That it was directed both by *S. James* and *S. Basil's* Liturgies, and lastly, that it was testified by the *Carthaginian* Fathers, to be the same which Christ delivered as his Blood. This I think, is as full a Testimony as can be, and such as no Body either expected or desired more from the Decree.

To the two following Objections I answer, (s) that the Question is whether the Practice and Testimony of the Seventh Century be not a better Evidence of that of the Sixth, and the Sixth of that of the Fifth, and so on, than it is possible the after Ages shou'd; and whether it be imaginable, that the *Trullan* Fathers, who li-

(s) See also what is said upon them in the *Vind. of the Reasons*, &c. Part I. p. 29, 30, 31.

(*t*) Coun.
IV. Can. 4.
(*u*) Dial. I.
Vol. 4. p.
17.
(*x*) De
Doctr. Ch.
L. 4. c. 21.
(*y*) De Ecc.
Dog. cap.
42.

ved in the Seventh Century shou'd so exactly agree with the Council of *Orleans* in the Sixth (*t*) Century, and that with *Theodoret*, (*u*) *S. Austin*, (*x*) and *Gennadius* (*y*) in the Fifth, and they with the Council of *Carthage*, and *S. Basil* in the Fourth, and these again with *S. Cyprian* in the Third, and *S. Cyprian* with *S. Clement*, *Irenaeus* and *Justin Martyr* in the Second, and these with the Practice from which the *Ebionites* revolted, who lived in the Apostolical Age, and lastly, that Practice with our Saviour's own Words, if interpreted, as all Words ought to be interpreted, according to the Idiom of the Language in which they were spoken; I say the Question is whether it be imaginable, that there shou'd be this universality of consent, this Series and Succession of Agreement thro' so many Ages, if either the Practice or the Tradition of the Mixture had been interrupted, or the *Trullan* Fathers mistaken in their Evidence. It can be of no force then to urge the erroneous Determination of the second Council of *Nice*, as if because that was mistaken, the *Trullan* Synod was not to be depended upon; for the first was a singular and contradicted Testimony, whereas the other had the Concurrence and Acknowledgment of the present and preceeding Ages. But this the learned Objector tells us, wou'd, if true, have render'd their Testimony useless and (*z*) insignificant. But (*t*) No just Gr. p. 109. under favour, tho' the Testimony of the earliest times be sufficient to overbalance any modern Practice, yet is the Reception and Agreement of the subsequent Ages no mean Confirmation of that Testimony. For as the length and compass of a River

argues the Strength of the Spring from which it flows, so does the Extent and Continuance of a Doctrine, proportionably encrease the proof of the Tradition from which it is derived, and I question not, but if the Necessity of the Mixture had not suffer'd among the common Corruptions of the *Roman Church*, but had been conveyed down thro' all the following Ages, this Gentleman wou'd have found no difficulty in the Language of the first Fathers, nor have made any scruple to interpret the Testimonies produc'd for the Mixture, as the Advocates for that Doctrine have interpreted them. The consent then of the succeeding Ages of the Church is of Service to settle the continuance of any Doctrine, and to obviate all unnecessary scruples about the Sense of the first times, every Age being the best Interpreter of the preceeding, and it does without doubt encrease in Strength and Authority, in proportion to the length of its Succession.

It may here be proper to take Notice of an Observation more than once made by this Gentleman, that an *Essentiality* cannot be raised upon an (a) *Uncertainty*, from whence he wou'd draw this Conclusion, that the Water cannot be Essential, because the Evidence for it is not absolutely certain. But the Reader may please to advert that the Essentiality of any part of the Eucharist does not depend upon the Certainty or Uncertainty of our Knowledge, but upon the Institution of Christ, and might therefore be certain tho' we knew nothing of it. But indeed he ought to have put the Case thus, whether a probable Essentiality cannot be raised upon probable

(a) No just
Gr. p. 108.

ble Evidence, and then it wou'd have been plainly against his Purpose. For if there be a high Probability that the Water is Essential, then there is a high Probability, that where it is wanting, there is no Sacrament. And then the Question will be, whether in a Matter of the utmost Concern, we are to choose the possible or the probable side of the Question, whether we are to put the Event of Eternity, and hazard the remission of our Sins, and the influences of God's Spirit upon a likely or an unlikely Performance of our Duty, upon the Practice of the Universal Church, or that of the *Armenian* Hereticks, upon Reason or Supposition.

To what was said in Vindication of the Propriety of the *Jewish* Distinction between the Fruit of the Vine, and the Fruit of the Tree, the Objector has given no Answer. He has not denied but the Species may be expressed by the Genus, and the whole by a part, nor that pure Wine is a Species of the Fruit of the Tree, and the Fruit of the Vine a part of the Cup. Since then he has made no Objection to the Premises, nor offer'd any one reason against the justness of the Consequence, it is plain the Epithets of *vain* and *trifling*, which he has bestow'd upon the Distinction, are unguarded and indefensible. For his Instance of *Water-Cyder* cannot be look'd upon as any manner of Reason, because the Mixture of that Liquor cannot plead Custom and immemorial Usage, as the Mixture of the Wine is own'd to do, and sure nothing but Custom can give meaning to, and settle the Sense of a Figurative Expression. But if the Mixture of the one had been

as usual as that of the other, the Expression had been as warrantable.

The following Objections in relation to unleaven'd Bread, no ways affect the Merits of the Cause as was proved in the (b) Appendix, tho' this Gentlemen takes no Notice of the proof, and besides are obviated in the Postscript to this Treatise, to which therefore I refer the Reader.

To Conclude, in the affirmative of the Answerer's (c) Words. From what has been said, it appears pretty plain, that our Saviour used a mixt Cup, that he enjoined it to his Disciples, and that he made it a NECESSARY ESSENTIAL part of his Institution, because he never so much as once mentions the ingredients of the Cup, but by an Expression that signifies a Mixture, and because the Universal Church testifies this to have been his Practice.

(c) No just
Gr. p. III.

POST-



POSTSCRIPT.

WHAT the Author of the *New-Separation* has given us in defence of his Assertion that our Saviour certainly made use of unleaven'd Bread, being the most remarkable and substantial part of his Argument, I shall give it a particular Examination. But the remaining part being, as to the most material Objections, obviated in that very Book, against which it is written, in the foregoing Treatise, and in the *Vindication of the Reasons and Defence*, I shall content myself with referring to them for an Answer. The Writer is indeed pretty liberal of his Epithets, and plain in his Language, but I suppose he does not design them for Arguments, and if he thinks them ornaments, he may shine in his own Sphere. Terms of Calumny and Reproach give no inviting Complexion to a Discourse, and like frowns, only deform the face of their Author. It is no serviceable Circumstance that he sets out in a Tempest and engages in a Storm; that he borrows his Weapons from Passion and Resentment, and seems more dispos'd to Fight than to Reason. But let his own
Words

Words speak for themselves. I shall proceed to the Argument.

The Question then whether our Saviour used leaven'd or unleaven'd Bread at the Institution of his Supper having been long debated in the Christian World, and being a Controversy that no ways affects the merits of our Dispute; I shall not pretend to determine it either one way or the other. But since the Author of the *No Necessity* has affirmed, that *it is more certain that our Saviour made use of unleaven'd Bread, than that he made use of the* (d) *Mixture*, and an attempt is here made to vindicate that Assertion from Scripture and Tradition; I shall endeavour to shew the contrary of the one, and to prove the insufficiency of the other.

And First, S. Luke particulatly mentions the taking of the Paschal (e) Cup, tho' neither he nor any other of the Evangelists do any where declare that our Lord used the *Azuma*. This alone might be sufficient to Answer that Gentleman's Demand.

But 2dly, The Eastern and Western Churches are agreed that our Saviour mixed the Cup, whereas they have been divided about the Affair of the *Azuma* for near seven hundred Years;

¶ *adhuc sub judice lis est.*

It has been argued that S. John expressly testifies, that Christ was crucified on the Day of the Preparation of the (f) Passover, and consequently before the time of casting away the Leaven, which was not prohibited till the period in which the Lamb was com-

M

manded

(d) *No Necessity*
cess. p. 4.

(e) S. Luke
22. 17.

(f) S. John
19.

(g) Com-
pare *Exod.*
12. 6, 8.
with v. 17.
18.

manded to be (g) eaten. That therefore our Saviour in keeping the Passover, anticipated the Legal Observance, and Eat the Lamb the day before the Jews celebrated that Feast, but that we cannot suppose he then used unleaven'd Bread, because this would make the Feast of unleaven'd Bread to be of eight days continuance, whereas the Scripture directs but seven. And to reconcile S. John with the other Evangelists, who tell us that Christ celebrated his Supper on the first day of unleaven'd Bread, it has been observed that the Jewish Day is computed from the Evening, it being said in *Genesis*, that the Evening and the Morning were the first (h) Day; and that therefore the Day before the Feast of the unleaven'd (i) Bread might properly be called the first Day of unleaven'd Bread, because the Evening of that Day was the beginning of this; and since the unleaven'd Bread was not to be eaten till the Evening of that first Day, there is no Reason to suppose our Saviour made use of it at his Supper, which was celebrated the Evening before. To these Arguments others have been opposed, and those not inconsiderable, but, as I said before, I shall wave judging on either side, and only leave it with the Reader, whether there can be the same certainty in a controverted point, as in an acknowledged Practice, in the divided Opinions of the Eastern and Western Churches,

(i) πρώτη τῶν ἀζύμων τὴν πρὸ τῶν ἀζύμων φασί.
ἀντασι γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσπέρας ἀρὰ ἀειδμεν τὴν ἡμέραν
S. Chrysostom. Hom. 81. in S. Matth. 26.

Churches, as in their united Consent, in a partial as in an universal Testimony.

As for our Author's following Observations from the Controversy between Pope Victor and the Astatics, and his Testimonies from some of the Fathers, they neither of them seem sufficient to ascertain our Saviour's Practice in the point before us. For the Celebrating Easter when the Jews cast out the Leaven, (which is what Polycrates testifies of S. John, &c.) can only shew that that Apostle &c. kept Easter at the time of the Jewish Passover, which as I have before shewn, is argued from S. John to have been after our Saviour's Crucifixion. And this was most probably done as a learned Person (k) imagines, in compliance with the Jews, not as this Gentleman conjectures, in Conformity to our Saviour's time of observing the Paschal Feast. For Easter was not design'd to be kept in Memory of Christ's Solemnization of the Passover, but in Memory of the Proto-typical Lamb, that was slain upon the Cross, and rose from the Dead on the third Day.

(k) L'E-
strange's
Alliance
of Divine
Offices, p.
143. Ed. 3.
1699.

And as to the Fathers, they neither of them in any one of the Quotations, produced by this Gentleman, do once declare that our Lord made use of unleaven'd Bread. All that they testify is, that Christ celebrated the Passover upon the fourteenth (l) Moon, and one of them in the (l) N. Sep. very Passage cited by the Vindicator, declares that our Lord eat the Passover on the Evening that began the first Day of unleaven'd Bread, and consequently before the time prescribed for the eating unleaven'd Bread, which did not com-

p. 7. 8.

mence till the Evening that concluded that first (m) Day. If then S. Austin by fixing the time of Christ's Passover on the fifth of the Sabbath did not by those Terms design to testify our Saviour's use of unleaven'd Bread, why shou'd we suppose the other Fathers did? Why shou'd we extend their Sense beyond his, and make them both mean differently by the same Expression?

(n) N. Sep. *Origen* indeed is urged to a farther purpose, and we are told that he says, that Christ did perform his last Passover after the Jewish (n) manner. But after the Jewish manner is a loose Expression, and does not necessarily suppose an entire Conformity. Nay since S. John has told us that Christ did not conform to the Jews in their time of solemnizing that Festival, which yet was a part of the Institution, it is plain he did not perform his Passover entirely after the Jewish manner. But if the time be not included in those terms, why shou'd we include the unleaven'd Bread? If one part of the Precept be excepted, with what reason can we contend that the other is not? For since the whole of this Argument is drawn from the Generality of the Expression, the destroying that Generality must destroy the Argument.

(o) Id. ib. But S. Jerome is cited as declaring that the first day of unleaven'd Bread is the fourteenth day of the first Month, when the Ferment is cast (o) away. And does this prove that our Lord used unleaven'd Bread? The first day of unleaven'd Bread might be the Day on which the Ferment was cast away, and yet since that was not to be done

done 'till the Evening that concluded that
 (p) Day, it does by no means shew that (p) Ex. 12.
 Christ eat unleaven'd Bread, who solemn- 18.
 ized the Passover on the Evening that be- Deut. 16. 6.
 gan it. In a Word, let these Testimonies
 be interpreted agreeably to S. Austin, who
 is one of the Number, and they make no-
 thing to our Author's Purpose, or else let
 them submit to the earlier Authority of Ju-
 stin (q) Martyr and (r) Tertullian, who both
 testify that our Lord was crucified on the
 Day of the Passover, the first Day of un-
 leaven'd Bread.

From what has been said, I think it
 clearly appears that the *Azuma* is not a
 Matter of such indisputable certainty as
 the Mixture, and I might here add, that
 the Scripture Term is not ἀζυμος but ἄρτος,
 and this Gentleman wou'd do well to give
 one instance, where ἄρτος is used for unlea-
 ven'd Bread, before he asserts with so much
 assurance, that Christ made use of the *Azy-
 ma*. However since I have offer'd these
 Arguments not to tye down any Man's O-
 pinion to a Matter which is as learnedly op-
 posed as defended, but to shew that there
 are many Objections against the one, when
 the other has hardly a Gainsayer but a-
 mong the Writers of this Controversy, I
 shall leave the Event with the Reader.

As for what was urged from Cardinal Bo-
 na, it may be sufficient to refer to the Third,
 Seventh and Ninth Sections of the 23d.
 Chapter

(q) — "Οἱ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ πάχα συνελθόντες αὐτὸν, καὶ
 ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ πάχα ἐσθαρῶσά τε γέγευται. Dial.
 cum Tryph. p. 325. Ed. Jebb.

(r) — primā die Azymorum interficeretis Christum.
 adv. Jud. cap. xi.

Chapter of his first Book *De Rebus Liturgicis* for proof of it, and consequently for an Answer to this Gentleman's Inditement, And in like manner it may suffice to remit the Reader to the Sixth and Eighth Pages of the *Necessity of an Alteration* for a reply to the Objection concerning the Method of leavening by Salt, &c. The Cases are indeed by no means parallel. For Bread may be leaven'd without an additional Substance, and consequently the Salt is a Circumstantial Usage, because whatsoever may be wanted in a Composition, is not necessary to it, and whatsoever is not necessary to it, is a mere Circumstance. But Wine cannot be mixed without a different Ingredient, and therefore that Ingredient is a necessary Addition. The first then may be used or rejected, because all Circumstances are indifferent, but the latter cannot be rejected, because it is not a Circumstance.

To proceed then, it is by no means a good Argument, that because *Justin Martyr* in his Account of the Christian Worship mentions the Kiss of Charity, as well as the Eucharistical Water, therefore the one may as properly be referr'd to the subsequent Account of the Institution, as the (s.) other. For the Water is join'd with the Bread and Wine, which are allow'd to be the subject of the Institution, but the Kiss of Charity is plainly separated from them. The Martyr appeals to our Saviour's Words for the change of the Elements, not for the Ceremonies of the Administration. That part then of the Context, which respects the Elements, must be connected to the Appeal, not that which has

(s) N.S. p.

14.

has no relation to them. *Justin* declares the Christian Eucharist to be founded upon Christ's command and affirms Bread, Wine and Water to be that Eucharist, but he affirms no such thing of the Kiss of Charity, and consequently does not refer it to the same Original.

To the Objections from the Practice of the Romanists, that they join with *Justin Martyr* in calling the mix'd Cup the Eucharist, and with *Irenaeus* in naming it the blood of Christ, though at the same time they declare against the Essentiality of the (t) Water, I answer that the Romanists have (t) N. S. p. in more cases than one retain'd the Lan- 15, 19. guage of the Primitive Church, when they have gone off from the Doctrine of it, and it is notorious that many learned Members of the Church of England have proved the Novelty of the Purgatorial Doctrine from the Language of the ancient Prayers for the dead, tho' that very Language be used in the *Canon Missæ*. Besides it has always been thought a good proof against Transubstantiation, that *S. Paul* and *Justin Martyr* call it Bread after Consecration, and yet the Romanists do the (u) same. This Argu- (u) Can. ment then can only shew that their Lan- Missæ. guage is inconsistent with their Principles and that they are condemn'd by their own Mass-Book. *Ex ore suo*. Nor is it any wonder that they apply our Saviour's Precept to the (x) Mixture, since they profess (x) N. S. p. to believe that Christ mix'd the Institu- 15. ted (y) Cup. (y) Conc.

Our Author observes upon *S. Cyprian*, that *aqua sola* signifies Water alone, not Water without (z) Wine; but does not (z) N. S. p. the Martyr oppose those Words to a mixed 25.

Cup ?

Cup? And what is Water alone when opposed to a mixed Cup but Water without
 (a) Il. 18. Wine, as Man alone in *Genesis* (a) was Man without a Help-meet? He proceeds and says *S. Cyprian* quotes the *inebriating Cup*
 (b) N. S. of the (b) *Psalms* as a Type of the Eucharist; but this can do him no Service, unless
 p. 26. he cou'd shew that a mix'd Cup cannot inebriate. Nor in like manner will his reasoning from *Tertullian* have any Cogency unless he cou'd make it appear that Wine cannot be distinguished by the Taste in a Mixture.

Optatim's saying that Wine is offered in
 (c) Ib. p. Sacrifice to (c) God does no more exclude
 29. Water than Bread, and consequently is wide of the Purpose.

(d) Ib. p. *S. Cyril's* *οἶνος* (d) *αἶμα* is plainly opposed to
 30. consecrated not mix'd Wine, and therefore proves nothing. And indeed if it was to be understood in this Writer's Sense of mere undiluted Wine, it would directly make against his Purpose, because what was *αἶμα* before the Invocation is clearly intimated to be the contrary afterwards.

Theodore's calling the Fruit of the Vine
 (e) Ib. p. by the Name of (e) Wine is no more than
 31. *S. Chrysostom* had done before, and that has already been shewn to be no ways prejudicial to the Doctrine of the (f) Mixture, besides that this same *Theodore* declares that

(f) p. 10. our Lord call'd the Mixture his (g) Blood,
 (g) Dial. which plainly proves that he did not design to exclude Water, when he calls the Representation of that Blood by the name of Wine.

Our Author's Notion of the Disagreement of the Ancients about the Signification of the Mixture, cou'd (if true) no more prove that to have been never instituted, than the Disagreement of the Philosophers about any Phenomenon can prove that Phenomenon never to have had a Being. And as to his declaring those mystical Significations to have been the *only Reason which was given for the use of* (h) *Water*, it is contrary (b) N. S. to Fact. For *Justin Martyr, Irenaus, S. Cy-* P. 36.
prian, the Commentary upon S. Mark, ascribed to S. Jerome, and Theodoret, and others declare the Mixture to have been practis'd by Christ, and to represent his Blood, as may be seen in the Passages cited from these Fathers.

The Argument concerning the *Fruit of the* (i) *Vine* is of no Force, because two of (i) Ib. p. the three Fathers produced as Evidences of 38. those Words signifying mere Wine testify that our Saviour mix'd his Cup, and cannot possibly therefore be imagined to have designed to exclude Water from that Cup; besides that their Words only prove that *the Fruit of the Vine* does not mean Water, not, that it does not mean a (k) Mix- (k) Necess. ture. p. 201.

As to Pope *Alexander's* instituting the Mixture, it is directly contrary to that Pope's own Words as cited in the Council of *Tribur*, where he says, that *neither Wine alone, nor Water alone, ought to be offered, AS WE HAVE RECEIVED FROM THE* (l) *FATHERS, &c.* and is also opposed by the learned *Bona*, who tells (l) Can. us, that *Alexander* the 1st. was not the Au- 19. thor of the (m) Mixture.

(m) De
Reb. Li.

The Reasoning upon *Tertullian* is foreign and unsupported, for he has not produc'd one Instance, were *Oblations for the Dead* are taken either for *Legacies* or *Loaves*, and has in his former Book expressly acknowledged the plain Limitation of those Words to the Eucharistick Sacrifice by S. (n) *Cyprian*, who being *Tertullian's* Scholar, and writing upon the same Subject of the Dead, cannot reasonably be supposed to design differently by the same Terms.

(n) No Necess. p. 32.

The Objections against S. *Cyprian's* Testimony are somewhat remote from the Purpose, because they are levelled against an imaginary Infallibility which no Body ascrib'd to him, and are founded upon a false Supposition that the Martyr did not look upon the Eucharistical Offerings for the Dead as a substantial Part of Religion; for it is certain the Eucharist cou'd not be offered for the Dead, if it had not been instituted for that Purpose, and it is as certain that whatever our Saviour instituted is of the substance of Religion. As to the communicating of Infants it is not a Parallel to the Oblations for the Dead, because the Neglect of the First makes no Breach in Communion, as that of the latter does. For tho' Infants be not actually communicated, they are included in the general Oblation, which is made for all the Members of Christ's Church, among whom they are enrolled by Baptism. The one is an Exclusion from the Membership of Christ's Body, the other is only a temporary Suspension of the actual Participation. And that the Church thought this Suspension a lawful Discipline upon prudential Reasons, is

is evident from the different Practice of communicating every Day in some Churches, and suspending that Interval for a longer Space in others; from their suspending the Administration of Baptism to particular Seasons of the Year, and from the corresponding Direction of the Church of England, in suspending the communicating of two Laicks, where the Number cannot be (o) increased. And lastly, as for S. Cy- (o) Rubr
prian's Notion of the Happiness of the Martyrs, of their enjoying the Presence of God, and of the unalterable State of the after the Com. Service.
(p) Dead, it is by no means an Argument (p) N. S.
that he thought Prayers and Sacrifices for P. 51. 52.
the Departed a useless and unnecessary Performance, because S. Austin openly declares that the faithful Deceased are not yet admitted to the Kingdom promised by Christ to the (q) Saints, notwithstanding he as- (q) Conc.
serts with S. Cyprian that they are in the I in Psal.
Presence of the Lord, and never deserted by the 36. cited
beatifick Presence of (r) Christ; and because by Pearson upon
Tertullian did not think it at all inconsistent the Creed,
to say that the Soul upon its Departure was p. 247.
determined either to eternal Misery, or eternal (r) De ci-
(s) Bliss, and that every Soul was in an in- vit. Dei.
termediat State 'till the (t) Resurrection. But L. 1: Cap.
if S. Cyprian's Words do not exclude the 12. and
intermediate State, they do not exclude Ep. 99. 1b.
Prayers for the Dead; and if they do not (s) De
exclude Prayers for the Dead, the Inter- Testim. a-
pretation of *Oblationes* and *Sacrificia*, which nim. Cap.
is founded upon that Exclusion, must fall of 4.
Course. (t) De A-
nima. Cap.
55.

S. Cyrill's Declaration that the Martyrs are mentioned in the Eucharistick Service as Intercessors does not necessarily suppose

(u) N. S. *that we are not to pray for (u) them, as appears from their being both prayed for among the Faithful, and mention'd as Intercessors within the Distance of ten Lines in S. Chrysostom's Liturgy.*

(x) De. ob.
Val.

What is said upon S. Ambrose is of no force, because that Father himself declares, that the want of Baptism was not the Emperours (x) fault, and as for the Words, *if my Prayers will be of Service to you*, they do no more express a Doubt of their Serviceableness, than *if there be a God, the World is govern'd by Providence*, expresses a Doubt of the Being of a God.

(y) P. 752.
Ed. Paris.

What is cited from Du-Pin in derogation of Epiphanius's Authority was never designed by that Author to render his Writings or Testimony useless, and can therefore be of no Service to the Purpose for which it is brought. For Du-Pin, a very few Pages before that Citation, makes use of his Authority against (y) Scultetus, and which is more in the Account of his Dogms tells us, that he PROVES *Prayers for the Dead in his 75th Heresy*, and REPUTES the contrary Opinion of (z) Aerius.

(4) N. S.
P. 61.

The Assertion that S. Chrysostom's Testimony for Prayers for the Dead relates only to his own Patriarchate cannot be true, because they are mention'd as the Office of the Priesthood, which is the same all the World over; nor is the other any more to be depended upon which declares that S. Chrysostom in this very Place intimates, that it was the Practice of the Church to pray for (a) Sinners. For he only says that the Priest is an Intercessor with God, that he may be propitious to the Sins of the Dead, which does by

no Means suppose the Persons prayed for to have departed in a State of Impenitence, as appears from the ancient Liturgies, which petition for Remission of Sins to the Deceased, and at the same Time confine that Petition to such as have departed with the Sign of Faith, and rest in the Sleep of Peace; besides that the very State of Death is a Punishment for Sin; for if *Adam* had not sinned, as *S. Paul* (b) tells us, Man had not died; and therefore while that State remains, the Punishment remains, and while the Punishment remains, the Sin cannot be said to be entirely forgiven, notwithstanding the faithful deceased are secure of Forgiveness. But if the Sin be not entirely forgiven, it is certainly proper to pray that it may. The Reader may see this Practice farther accounted for in the *Reasons*, p. 17, 18.

(b) 1 Cor.
15. 21, 22.

The Observation upon the reasoning from the Greek Liturgies, &c. that it supposes the Controversy to have been, whether an Article of Faith be (c) necessary, is a great (c) N. S. Mistake; for it supposes no such thing, but goes upon this Ground, that the consentient Practice of the Liturgies, together with the Testimonies cited from the Fathers proves the Oblations for the Dead to be a necessary Usage, because they cou'd not be used upon any other Principle but that of Charity and Communion, and because all Acts of Charity were of indispensable Obligation, and the Communion of Saints an Article of Faith. There was then no impropriety in denying the Parallel between the Agreement of the Liturgies in praying for the Dead, and their Agreement in other

other Practices of Ceremony or Discipline, because the one related to an Article of Faith, the other only to a circumstantial Practice, any more than if one should argue that tho' there be Scripture-Testimony for the Kiss of Charity as well as for the Communion of the Cup, they were by no Means of equal Necessity, because the one was Matter of Ceremony, and the other Part of an Institution. However the Liturgy in the Constitutions which Dr. Brett has shewn to be the Standard of all the

(d) Dis- (d) rest, has not one of our Author's Instances of Innovation, and consequently those Instances have not an universal Agreement to support them.

fert. on
Liturg. p.
32. & seq.

As for his *Purgatorial Objections*, the praying for Refreshment and Mercy for the Dead does no more suppose them in a State of Torment or *Purgatory*, than the praying for Grace and Wisdom for the King's Council supposes them to be Re-
probates and (e) Fools.

(e) Litany
in the
Common-
Prayer
Book.

The New Communion-Office is no Part of the Controversy, and therefore whatever Arguments are used against it, go for nothing, besides that it has been fully vindicated from this Gentleman's Aspersions in the Second Part of the *Vindication of the*

(f. p. 110, *Reasons and* (f) *Defence,*
111, 112.

The Reasoning upon the Words *εὐλογήσας* (g) *εὐχαριστήσας* is of no force, because they certainly show a positive Command for blessing the Elements, and consequently for praying for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them, which has been proved to be implied in the Notion of Blessing. And besides it has been observed that S. Paul speak-

(g) N. S.
p. 65.

Speaking of the same Eucharistick Institution uses the same Expression of *εὐλογέω* in such a Manner as is incapable of being interpreted to a giving of (h) Thanks, which alone is a sufficient Answer to all that has been objected concerning the Scripture Language. (b) *Nec. p. 131. and Vindic. of the Real, and Def. par. 11; p. 121.*

The Objection against S. Basil's Testimony, that by *ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα* he does not mean the Invocation of the Holy Ghost but the Communion (i) Office, can have no Weight, because that Interpretation is only affirmed, but not offered to be proved either from the Context or any other Greek Writer whatsoever, whereas we have prov'd the Construction we plead for from the Practice of the Church, from the Language of a co-temporary Writer, and from S. Basil's own Direction in his (k) Liturgy. (i) *N. S. p. 67.* (k) *Nec. p. 135, 136.*

As for the *ἐπίκλησις* of S. Cyril, himself declares what he means by it in the most unexceptionable Terms, when he says we address the God of Mercy to send down his Holy Spirit upon the Elements which are set before him, that it may make the Bread the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ. For upon whatsoever, the Holy Spirit descends, that is sanctified and (l) changed.

The Objection against the Testimony of Justin Martyr and the other Fathers, that not one of them knew of the Form, which was plead-

(l) παρακαλῶμεν τὸν φιλόανθρωπον θεὸν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστέλλαι ἐπὶ τὰ περὶ κείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα χριστοῦ πάντως γὰρ ὅταν ἐφάψαιτο τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὸτο ἡγίανται, καὶ μεταβιβληται. *Mytag. V. p. 297. Ed. Mill.*

(m) N. S. *pleaded* (m) *for*, is contrary to Fact, because
 p. 69. some of them expressly mention it, and
 those that do not are yet full for the *Bles-*
sing, which this Gentleman knows is all
 that we contend for.

This Article then is evidently sup-
 ported both by Scripture and Tradition.

The Reflections upon the *New Commu-*
nion-Office, and the Suggestion of farther
 Alterations are obviated by the Learned
 Author of the *Vindication of the Reasons*,
 (n) *Vind.* &c. who has assur'd the World, that we
 par. 2. *are still willing to close upon the old* (n) *Pro-*
 p. 113. *posals.*

The Citation from *S. Paul* is nothing to
 our Author's Purpose, because he acknow-
 ledges the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, and
 there can be no imaginable Reason for sup-
 posing that our Saviour deviated from the
 common sacrificial Practice of offering by
 Prayer, and neither followed the universal
 Custom of the Ages before him, nor was
 himself followed by those that succeeded,
 which yet must be the Case, if at the Insti-
 tution he used no manner of Oblatory Ad-
 dress to the Father. But if he did, it is
 most reasonable to believe that Address in-
 cluded in the *undecimus*, in the Eucharisti-
 cal Prayer, both because there is no other
 Expression in the Account of the Institu-
 tion that relates to Prayer, and because the
 most ancient Eucharistical Prayer in the
 World has such an Oblation.

The No-necessity of mentioning the
 (o) N. S. Names of the (o) Dead in the Prayer of
 p. 73. Oblation can no more prove the indiffer-
 ence of such a Prayer, than the No-neces-
 sity of mentioning the Names of the Faith-
 ful

ful in the *Supplication* for all (o) *Saints*, can prove the indifference of such a *Supplication*. ^{(o) Ephes. 6. 18.}

The Discourse, with which our Author concludes his Observations will not easily prove that the Modellers of the Liturgy in 1661 believed the Doctrine of the Sacrifice, because there is no such Word as *Altar* in the latest Rubricks of the Church of England; (and if there had, both *Priest* and *Altar* have often been abused to a figurative Sense,) and because the Prayer of Oblation is not yet restored to its proper Situation: But if it wou'd prove their Belief of the Sacrificial Doctrine; yet since that Belief can never supply the Want of an Oblatory Prayer, the Scruple still remains and we are to seek for Satisfaction. And as to his Proposal of *supplying the Defect by silent (p) Devotion*, it is destructive of all Order and Discipline; it ^{(p) N.S. p. 75.} gives every Priest a Latitude of Dispensation, raises him above the Rubrick, and makes him his own Ordinary. For to add to the publick Direction by a private and silent Provision is certainly not to consecrate according to the Order and Mind of the Church. But besides, this will no ways account for the Administrations of those who disown the Doctrine contended for, or don't think themselves at Liberty to follow this Gentleman's Example; so that they are yet chargeable with the Defect, and I think I need not prove that we can no more be Members of a Defective Communion, than Ministers of a defective Administration.

Thus I have considered those Arguments in the *New Separation*, which appeared to be new, and to carry any Plausibility of Ob-
 O jection

jection against the Points contended for. And as to the Articles or Reasons, which are not here taken notice of, the Reader may see them satisfactorily answered under their respective Heads in the Books already published.

THE INDEX.

Alex. 70 in the Revelation shewn to be spoken of a mixed Cup. Page 49, 50

Alexander Pope, not the Author of the Mixture, Postscript p. 97.

S. Ambrose, his Testimony for Prayers for the Dead vindicated Po p 100

Athanasius, the Objection from a disputed Treatise of his answer'd H p 50, 51, 52

His Testimony for the Mixture refer'd to p 81

S. Austin's Testimony consider'd p 81, 82

B
Bartenora's Explanation of *R. Eliezer's* Testimony p 9

His Testimony that the Jews never drank unmix'd Wine p 14

S. Basil, the Objections from his Liturgy answer'd p 32, to 37

His Testimony for the Invocation vindicated, Po. p 103

Unlawful to enjoy any Thing without Blessing of it in the Opinion of the Jews p 15

C

S. Chrysostom reconcil'd with the Talmud p 20, 21
His Testimony that Christ deliver'd Wine con-
sidered p 30, to 32

—— For Prayers for the Dead vindicated,
Po. p 100, 101

Clemens Alexandrinus's Testimony vindicated,
p 66 to 75

Cup (The Jewish) call'd the *Fruit of the Vine*,
both from the Excellency and Mixture of the
Wine p 18

S. Cyprian, the Argument from his Account of
the Disuse of the Wine consider'd p 23

His Testimony for the Mixture vindicated,
p 75 to 78. Po. 95, 96

—— For Oblations for the Dead Po. p 98, 99
S. Cyrill, the Objections from him about the Mix-
ture examined p 27, to 30. Po. 96

His Testimony that the Saints are Intercessors no
Argument that they are not to be prayed for,
Po. p 99, 100

—— For the Invocation vindicated Po. p. 103

E

Easter, the Controversy about the Observation
of it p 78

R. Eliezer testifies that the *Fruit of the Vine*
signifies a Mixture p 9

He lived but 37 Years after our Lord's Cruci-
fixion p 9, to 17

He is declared to be a Man of prodigious Reputa-
tion by *Surenhusius*, *Maimonides* and the
Mishna p 16

He is preferr'd to all the wise Men in *Israel* by
the *Mishna* p 17

He opposes the wise Men in the very same Point,
in

in which Christ condemned the *Pharises* *ib.*
 He and the wise Men differ only about the Time,
 not the Signification of the Blessing p 16
Epiphanius, his Authority not lessen'd by *Du-*
Pin Po. p 100
 That an Essentiality can't be rais'd upon an Un-
 certainty, shewn to be an evasive Proposition,
 p 85, 86
Ευλογίας, the Interpretation of it vindicated,
 Po. p 102, 103
Eustathius's Testimony considered p 41, 42
 44, to 46
Eusebius's Account of *Melchisedek* considered p 81

F

Fruit of the Vine proved to mean a Mixture,
 p 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19. Po. p 97
Fruit of the Tree ascribed to Wine p 17, 18
 The same Expression of *the Fruit of the Vine*,
 apply'd to the Eucharstic Cup in *S Matthew*,
 and the Paschal Cup in *S. Luke* p 80
 The Distinction between *the Fruit of the Vine*,
 and *the Fruit of the Tree*, vindicated as to its
 Propriety p 86, 87

G

The General Voice of the Primitive Church
 what? p 26, 27

H

R. Hillel testifies that the Blessing of the Pas-
 chal Cup was preceded by the Mixture p 19
 He lived before the Birth of Christ p 9, 19
 He died in or about Christ's Time p 9
 Of the Holy Kiss, &c. p 79

I

I

in which Christ condemned the Punters
 He and the wise Men after only about the Time
 not the Signification of the Blessing
 his Authority not less'd by
S. James's Epistle not mentioned by any coaval
 Testimony p 9, to
S. Jerome's Testimony consider'd p 80
 Infants, the communicating of them p 79
S. Irenaeus, the Objections against his Testimony
 solv'd p 58, to 66
S. Justin Martyr's Testimony for the Mixture
 vindicated p 53, to 57. Po. 94, 95
 For the Invocation defended Po. p 103,
 104

K

the Objections concerning the Ety-
 mology and Sense of it, answer'd p 36, to 53
L
 Libation Wine probably diluted p 46
Lightfoot's Citations from the *Talmud* proved ge-
 nuine, and a literal Translation of the Text,
 which is produced in the Margin p 13
 Liturgies Greek, their Testimony for Prayers
 for the Dead vindicated Po. p 101, 102
Lyons, the Church of it an Evidence for the
 Practice of all in the same Communion p 22

M

Maimonides's Testimony that the Jews never
 drank unmix'd Wine p 14
 His Evidence for the Mixture p 19
 Mixture, the No-Necessity of it own'd by the
 No just Grounds to have been borrow'd by
 the School-men from Jewish Post-Talmudical
 Testimony p 12
 Mixture,

Mixture, proved to have been in Use in the Apostolical Age p 66

The Millennial Tradition p 78

Mopsuestenus's Testimony answer'd p 50

Testimony for Tradition vindicated

Names of the Dead not necessary to be mention'd, because included in the general Prayer p 104

New Communion Office no part of the Controversy p 102

Of Universal Bread

Optatus, the Objection from him examin'd p 96

Origen, the Argument from him consider'd p 24, 25, 26

The Mystical Signification of it

Platarch's Testimony vindicated p 42, 43

Proposals, (the old) we are still willing to close upon them, Po. p 104

Proverbs IX. 2. the Objection from it answer'd, p 46, 47, 48

Purgatorial Objections answer'd p 102

Schamai testifies that the Paschal Cup was mix'd before it was bless'd p 19

He lived before the Birth of Christ p 9, 19

Spurious Writings of the Ancients, the Objection from them answer'd p 78, 79

Surenhusius's Citation of the Gemara p 13, 14

T

Tertullian's Testimony for Tradition vindicated;

p 5, 6, 7, 8

—— For Prayers for the Dead Po. p 98

Theodoret's Testimony consider'd Po. p 96

Tosepeth, a modern Addition to the Talmud;

p 11

The Traditions insisted on agreeable to Scripture,

p 4, 5

The Trullan Canon vindicated p 82, to 85

Of Unleaven'd Bread p 87. Po. 89, to 94

W

**Warm Water, the Objection about the Use of it
in the Greek Church answer'd** p 30

**Water never used to express a Mixture, as Wine
is** p 79

—— The Mystical Significations of it Po

p. 97,

**Wise Men, their Number, Age and Character,
unknown** p 16

**They differ from R. Eliezer only about the Time
not the Signification of the Blessing** Ib.

Z

Homer's *Σωκράτης*, the Objection from it answer'd

p 41, to 44

ERRATA.

PAGE 2. Marg. L. 1. for 10. r. f3. p 36.
L. 12. for certainly r. commonly. p. 50.
Marg. dele No just Gr. and for 19 r. 24. p. 60.
l. 4. r consisted. Ib. Marg. for 30, 41 r. 36, 50.
p. 66. l. 33. for π r v.



A CATALOGUE of the Writings on both Sides of the Con- troversy, according to the Order of Time in which they were published.

REASONS for restoring some Pray-
ers and Directions, as they stand
in the Communion-Service of the
first *English* reform'd Liturgy, compiled by
the Bishops in the 2d and 3d Years of the
Reign of King *Edward VI.* Printed for *John*
Morphew, and published in *September, 1717.*

No Reason for restoring the Prayers and
Directions of *Edward the VI's* first Litur-
gy. Printed for *John Morphew*, and pub-
lished in *October, 1717.* In Answer to the
Reasons.

A Defence of the Reasons, &c. Printed
for *John Morphew*, and published in *De-*
cember, 1717. In Answer to the *No Rea-*
son.

No Necessity to alter the Common-Pray-
er, &c. Published in *January, 1717-18.* and
sold by *J. Morphew.* In Answer to the *Rea-*
sons and Defence.

A Letter from Mr. *Lesley* to his Friend, &c.
published in *January, 1717-18.*

An Answer to a printed Letter, said to
be written by Mr. *Lesley*, &c. Printed by

H. P. for J. Morpew, and published in January, 1717-18.

No Reason to alter the present Liturgy, &c. on Account of Prayers for the Dead. Printed by H. P. for J. Morpew, and published in January, 1717-18.

No Sufficient Reason for restoring the Prayers, &c. Part I. Printed for J. Morpew, and published in May, 1718. In Answer to the *Defence*.

The Necessity of an Alteration, &c. Printed for J. Bettenham, and published in July, 1718. In Answer to *No Necessity*, and the first Part of *No sufficient Reason*.

Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the Holy Scriptures, with a Postscript in Answer to Part. of *No sufficient Reason*. By Tho. Brett, L. L. D. Printed for J. Bettenham, and published in July, 1718.

No sufficient Reason for restoring the Prayers, &c. Part II. Printed for J. Bettenham, and published in September, 1718. In Answer to the *Defence*.

A Vindication of the Reasons and Defence, &c. Part I. by the Author of the Reasons and Defence. Printed for J. Bettenham, and published in November, 1718. In Answer to the first Part of *No sufficient Reason*.

Mr. Collier's Desertion discuss'd, &c. Printed for C. Rivington, and published in February, 1718-19.

Vino Eucharistico Aqua non necessario admiscenda. Auctore Samuele Drake, C. D. I. E. S. impensis Gul. & Joh. Innys. Published in February, 1718-19. In Answer to the Reasons, the Defence of the Reasons, the Ne-

Necessity of an Alteration, the first Part of the Vindication of the Reasons and Defence, and Dr. Brett's Tradition necessary, &c.

A Vindication of the Reasons and Defence, &c. Part II. by the Author of the Reasons and Defence. Printed for J. Bettenham, and published in March, 1718-19. In Answer to the 2d Part of *No sufficient Reason.*

No just Grounds for introducing the New Communion Office, &c. Printed for J. Bettenham, and published in March, 1718-19. In Answer to the Appendix to the *Necessity of an Alteration*, and Dr. Brett's Postscript to *Tradition necessary* &c.

The Plaintiff's Charge disprov'd, &c. in a Letter to the Author of *No just Grounds for introducing the New Communion Office, &c.* Printed for J. Bettenham, and published in March, 1719. In Answer to a Passage in Page the 56th of *No just Grounds, &c.*

The New Separation from the Church of England groundless, being a Vindication of the *No Necessity, &c.* Printed for W. Mears, and published in April, 1719. In Answer to the *Necessity of an Alteration.*

A Dialogue in Vindication of our present Liturgy and Service, &c. Printed for J. Bettenham and T. Bickerton, and published in May, 1719. In Answer to the Plaintiff's Charge disprov'd, &c.

The Controversy about restoring some Prayers, &c. summed up. Printed for T. Bickerton, and published in July, 1719.

— A Letter from the Reverend Mr. Charles Lesley concerning the New Separation. Published in July, 1719. and sold by J. Morphew.

— An Answer to a Letter from the Reverend Mr. Charles Lesley, &c. Printed for J. Morphew, and published in August, 1719.

— *Vino Eucharistico aqua necessario admiscenda.* Auctore Thoma Wagstaffe. PA. A. Published in September, 1719. In Answer to Mr. Drake's *Vino Eucharistico Aqua non necessario admiscenda.* Sold by R. King.

— A Collection of the principal Liturgies used by the Christian Church in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist, &c. with a Dissertation upon them, &c. by Tho. Brett, L. L. D. Printed for R. King, and published in September, 1719.

— Mr. Lesley's Defence from some erroneous and dangerous Principles advanced in a Letter said to have been written by him, &c. Printed for J. Morphew, and published in October, 1719.

— A farther Proof of the Necessity of Tradition to explain and interpret the Holy Scriptures, &c. By Tho. Brett, L. L. D. Printed for R. King, and published in November, 1719. In Answer to Part of the *No just Grounds.*

— Mr. Collier's Desertion discuss'd, &c. The Second Edition, with considerable Enlargements. Printed for W. Boreham, and published in January, 1719-20.

— Reflections upon modern Fanaticism in Two Letters, to Dr. Brett, and the Author of a late Pamphlet ironically intitled Mr. Lesley's Defence, &c. By Matthias Earbery, Presbyter of the Church of England. Published

lished in *April*, 1720. and sold by *J. Mor-*
phew.

An Abridgment of the Controversy, &c. 1
Printed for *J. Morphew*, and published in
April, 1720.

The Reasonableness and Necessity of some 1
Practices of the Reformation of the Church
of *England*, &c. By the Author of the
Necessity of an Alteration, &c. Printed for
R. King. In answer to Part of the *No just*
Grounds, and the *New Separation from the*
Church of England groundless, &c.

BOOKS

II. The Doctrine of the Church of Rome
concerning Purgatory, proved to be con-
trary to Catholic Tradition, and in-
consistent with the necessary Duty of
Prayer.



B O O K S lately Printed for
Richard King, at the Prince's
Arms in St. Paul's Church Yard.

I. THE Trinity in Unity Vindicated,
and the following Questions answered. 1. *Which was the highest Exaltation of Humanity of Jesus Christ, for it to be so united to the supreme God (or as the Athanasian Creed expresses it, taken into God) as that it, and the Supreme God, which it is united to, do Constitute but one individual Person; or for it to be exalted at the Right Hand of the Supreme God.* 2. *When the Humanity of Jesus Christ was thus united to, or taken unto the supreme God, must it not be again separated from, or taken out of him, before it could be capable of being exalted at his Right Hand* Together with an Ode upon the Creation, in Imitation of the first Chapter of Genesis, &c. By Richard Roots, A. M. Rector of Chilmark in Wilts. pr. 1 s.

II. The Doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning Purgatory, proved to be contrary to Catholick Tradition, and inconsistent with the necessary Duty of
Pray-

Praying for the Dead, as practis'd in the ancient Church. By Mr. Thomas Deacon, Priest. *Prove all Things: Hold fast that which is good,* 1 Thes. v. 21 pr. 2 s.

III. The Unreasonableness of Deism, or the Certainty of a Divine Revelation, evinc'd from the Dictates of Reason in General, and the Evidence of our Holy Christian Faith in particular, with some Reflexions on our modern Pretenders to Free-thinking. Also modern Pleas for Anarchy and Rebellion, revived: Or a particular Examination of the Senses of S. Peter and S. Paul, concerning the Measures of Submission to the Civil Power. By Joseph Smith.

*Nullos esse, Deos inane calum
Affirmat SELIUS: probatque, quod se
Fatum, dum negat hac, evidet beatum.*
(Martial. pr. 4 s.

IV. The Church Catechism, with single Proofs taken from the Words of Scripture only, after a new Method. pr. 2 d. and 12 s. per Hundred.

V. The Christian Defence against the Fears of Death, with Directions how to die well. Written originally in French by Charles Drellingcourt, and Abridg'd from the last Edition by John Spavan, M. A. With a true Account of Mrs. Veal's Apparition to Mrs. Bargrave. pr. 1 s. 6 d. in Sheep, and 2 s. in Calf.

VI. The last Day. A Poem in 12 Books. By the late J. Bulkeley, Esq. of Clare-Hall,
in

in Cambridge, Author of the Letter to the
Reverend Mr. Clarke, on Liberty and Ne-
cessity. pr. 4 s. 6d.

VII. Choice Observations upon the Art of
Painting; together with *Vasari's* Lives of
the most eminent Painters from Cimabone
to the Time of *Raphael* and *Michael*
Angelo; with an Explanation of the dif-
ficult Terms. pr. 6 s. 6d.

VIII. The Memoires of Major *Alexan-*
der Ramkin, a Highland Officer, now in
Prison at *Avignon*: Being an Account of
several remarkable Adventurers during
about 28 Years Service in *Scotland*, *Ger-*
many, *Italy*, *Flanders* and *Ireland*; exhi-
biting a very agreeable and instructive
Lesson of Human Life, both in Publick
and Private Capacity, in several pleasant
Instances of his Amours, Gallantry, Oe-
conomy, &c. pr. 1 s.

IX. The Heroick Friendship a Tragedy.
By the late Mr. *Orway*. pr. 1 s. 6d.

V. The Christian Defence against the Forces
of Death, with Directions how to die
well. Written originally in French by
Charles Despreux, and translated from
the last Edition by *M. A.*
With a true Account of the Author's Ap-
plication to *Mrs. B.* pr. 1 s. 6d.

VI. The last Day. A Poem in 12 Books.
By the late *J. B.* pr. 1 s. 6d.